

## SENATE.

THURSDAY, June 26, 1919.

(Legislative day of Monday, June 23, 1919.)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 409) to consent to the proposed compact or agreement between the States of New Jersey and New York for the construction, operation, repair, and maintenance of a tunnel or tunnels under the Hudson River between the cities of Jersey City and New York with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1213) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 27, 1918, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. KAHN, Mr. ANTHONY, and Mr. DENT managers at the conference on the part of the House.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. LODGE. I present a memorial signed by 2,470 employees of the plant of the General Electric Co., at Pittsfield, Mass., remonstrating against the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law. I move that the memorial be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of Royal Lodge, No. 109, Daughters of St. George, of New Bedford, Mass., praying for the deportation of those aliens who, in order to escape military service, dropped their first naturalization papers, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented telegrams, in the nature of memorials, from sundry business firms in the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the continuance of the United States Employment Service, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the United Irish Societies of Holyoke, Mass., praying for the self-determination of Ireland, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Granville, Auburndale, Wellesley, Pittsfield, and Southwick, all in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Gleasondale, Medford, Stow, and Hudson, all in the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. EDGE presented a petition of the Baptist Home Missionary Society of New York and New Jersey, praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the governor of Ohio to take steps to prohibit the Willard-Dempsey prize fight, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of Paterson, N. J., praying for the enforcement of prohibition and for the extension of the same so as to include Americans in foreign countries where treaties permit, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CAPPER presented memorials of sundry citizens of Topeka, Sun City, Stockton, Oakley, Baldwin, McCune, Pleasanton, Jennings, Dodge City, Emporia, Frankfort, and Phillipsburg, all in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Emporia, Kansas City, Arkansas City, Topeka, and Mulberry, all in the State of Kansas, praying for Government ownership and control of railroads, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. PHELAN presented a petition of Arlington Lodge, No. 414, Free and Accepted Masons, of Los Angeles, Calif., praying

for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of Willow Camp, No. 163, Woodmen of the World, of Hanford, Calif., praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN presented a petition of the congregation of the Broadway Reformed Church, of Paterson, N. J., praying for the enforcement of prohibition and for the extension of the same so as to include Americans in foreign countries where such is permitted by treaties, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HALE presented a petition of the Maine State Federation of Labor, praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. POMERENE presented a petition of sundry citizens of Akron and of Summit County, in the State of Ohio, praying for the repeal of the so-called luxury tax, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, praying for the repeal of the tax on ice cream, soda, and soft drinks, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON CLAIMS.

Mr. SPENCER, from the Committee on Claims, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 219) for the relief of Kate Canniff (Rept. No. 47);

A bill (S. 257) for the relief of certain officers in the Army of the United States, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 48);

A bill (S. 715) for the relief of the Atlas Lumber Co., Babcock & Willcox, Johnson, Jackson & Corning Co., and the C. H. Klein Brick Co., each of which companies furnished to Silas N. Opdahl, a failing Government contractor, certain building materials which were used in the construction of Burke Hall at the Pierre Indian School, in the State of South Dakota (Rept. No. 46);

A bill (S. 728) for the relief of the Buffalo River Zinc Mining Co. (Rept. No. 51);

A bill (S. 1004) for the relief of the owner of the steam lighter *Cornelia* (Rept. No. 40);

A bill (S. 1005) for the relief of the owner of the steamship *Matoa* (Rept. No. 41);

A bill (S. 1006) for the relief of the owners of the schooner *Horatio G. Foss* (Rept. No. 42);

A bill (S. 1222) for the relief of the owners of the schooner *Henry O. Barrett* (Rept. No. 43);

A bill (S. 1223) for the relief of the owner of the steamer *Mayflower* and for the relief of passengers on board said steamer (Rept. No. 44);

A bill (S. 1377) for the relief of Amherst W. Barber (Rept. No. 45); and

A bill (S. 1694) providing for the refund of taxes collected for stamp tax on certain policies under the emergency tax act of October 22, 1914, under the proviso to which act such policies were exempt (Rept. No. 49).

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 687) to reimburse Horace H. Choumard, chaplain in the Twenty-third Infantry, for the loss of certain personal property, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 50) thereon.

Mr. WOLCOTT, from the Committee on Claims, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 767) for the relief of the heirs of W. H. Sneed, deceased (Rept. No. 55);

A bill (S. 1375) for the relief of Catherine Grace (Rept. No. 54); and

A bill (S. 1670) for the relief of the Arundel Sand & Gravel Co. (Rept. No. 53).

## SUNDY CIVIL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. WARREN. From the Committee on Appropriations I report back favorably with amendments the bill (H. R. 6176) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and I submit a report (No. 52) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

## AMERICAN TROOPS IN SIBERIA.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. From the Committee on Foreign Relations I report back favorably with amendments Senate resolution No. 13, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas it is reported in the public press that 8,000 United States soldiers are to be sent to Siberia; and  
Whereas the purposes for which the said soldiers are dispatched to Siberia are undisclosed and unknown: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of State and the Secretary of War be, and they are hereby, requested immediately to inform the Senate of the reasons for sending 8,000 United States soldiers to Siberia, what duties are there to be performed by these soldiers, how long they are to remain, and generally to advise the Senate of the policy of the United States Government in respect to Siberia and the maintenance of United States soldiers therein.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. KING. I object.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Will you permit me to suggest that the resolution has been amended by the committee, and as amended met with, I think, the unanimous approval of the members of the committee? It is amended and was not read as amended.

Mr. ROBINSON. Has the resolution been referred to the committee or reported by it?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes; the committee reports the resolution, and it was amended in accordance with the request of the committee yesterday.

Mr. ROBINSON. I object.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I think it was reported out unanimously.

Mr. ROBINSON. I object to its present consideration.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I think the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], who is present, will confirm that statement.

Mr. SWANSON. It was amended so as to be a direction to the President "if not incompatible with the public interest."

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Exactly. Will the Secretary please read it as amended?

Mr. SWANSON. I did not vote for the report, but I do not see any serious objection to it.

Mr. KING. I object to its consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution goes to the calendar.

The amendments of the Committee on Foreign Relations were, in line 1, after the word "the," to strike out "Secretary of State and the Secretary of War be, and they are" and insert "President be, and he is"; in line 3, after the word "Senate," to insert "if not incompatible with the public interest"; and in the same line, after the word "sending," to strike out "8,000," so as to make the resolution read:

Whereas it is reported in the public press that 8,000 United States soldiers are to be sent to Siberia; and

Whereas the purposes for which the said soldiers are dispatched to Siberia are undisclosed and unknown: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the President be, and he is hereby, requested immediately to inform the Senate, if not incompatible with the public interest, of the reasons for sending United States soldiers to Siberia, what duties are there to be performed by these soldiers, how long they are to remain, and generally to advise the Senate of the policy of the United States Government in respect to Siberia and the maintenance of United States soldiers therein.

#### COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS.

Mr. CALDER, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate resolution 93, submitted by Mr. FERNALD on the 24th instant, reported it favorably without amendment and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-sixth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding \$1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recess of the Senate.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred, as follows:

By Mr. SPENCER:

A bill (S. 2254) extending the time for the construction of a bridge across the White River at or near Forsyth, Mo.; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 2255) granting a pension to George W. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

A bill (S. 2256) for the relief of Clotilda Freund; and

A bill (S. 2257) for the relief of George B. Hughes; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2258) to correct the military record of Edward Johnson; and

A bill (S. 2259) for the relief of Edward S. Farrow; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2260) amending the act of August 24, 1912, chapter 389, paragraph 1 (37 Stats., p. 550), to include periodical publications of regularly incorporated charitable organizations, admitting such publications to the mails as second-class matter; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 2261) granting a pension to Rolph M. Collins;

A bill (S. 2262) granting a pension to Barney McKay;

A bill (S. 2263) granting a pension to Clara Farlow; and

A bill (S. 2264) granting a pension to H. Frederika Olcott; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 2265) for the relief of William L. Ross (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

A bill (S. 2266) granting a pension to Elvira James;

A bill (S. 2267) granting an increase of pension to Alice Hingson; and

A bill (S. 2268) granting a pension to Orvilla Curry; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 2269) granting a pension to Ben F. Perkins;

A bill (S. 2270) granting a pension to James Green;

A bill (S. 2271) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan Colyar (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2272) granting a pension to Stephen J. Batchelder (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FERNALD:

A bill (S. 2273) granting an increase of pension to Ray Cope (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GERRY:

A bill (S. 2274) for the relief of the owners of the schooner *Charlotte W. Miller*; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2275) granting a pension to Mercy M. Douglas (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2276) granting a pension to Lydia A. Edwards; and

A bill (S. 2277) granting an increase of pension to Bernard Boyle (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COLT:

A bill (S. 2278) for the relief of John Healy (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

A bill (S. 2279) to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Humboldt National Forest; to the Committee on Public Lands.

#### SUITS IN ADMIRALTY.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Out of order I ask leave to introduce a bill on behalf of the Shipping Board. This legislation is really made necessary by reason of a late decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. I ask that the bill be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The bill (S. 2253) authorizing suits against the United States in admiralty, suits for salvage services, and providing for the release of merchant vessels belonging to the United States from arrest and attachment in foreign jurisdictions, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

#### WAR DEPARTMENT FILMS AND MOTION-PICTURE CAMERAS.

Mr. KING. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk. I will state that I have submitted it to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs as well as nearly all the members of the committee, and they have no objection whatever to it.

The resolution (S. Res. 95) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of War is directed to report to the Senate the number of film and motion-picture cameras and tripods or photographic laboratory equipment or projector machines and other photographic equipment now in the possession of the War Department, together with the location and value of such equipment.

#### AMENDMENT OF THE RULES.

Mr. KENYON. Notice is given that under Rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate I shall move, when the sundry civil appropriation bill is before the Senate, to suspend subdivision 3 of Rule XVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate prohibiting an amendment proposing general legislation on any general appropriation bill for the purpose of offering a new section or amendment to said sundry civil appropriation bill, as follows:

A joint commission to report to Congress a plan for a national budget system is hereby established. Its membership shall consist of the Secretary of the Treasury and two other officials of the executive department of the Government, to be appointed by the President; three Members of the Senate and three Members of the House, to be appointed by the presiding officer of the House and Senate, respectively.

SEC. 2. That no compensation shall be paid to any member of said commission.



Sec. 3. That said commission is hereby empowered and directed to report by January 1, 1920, a plan for the adoption of a national budget system for the Government of the United States, and showing therein what changes, amendments, or adjustments the adoption of said budget system would cause in the rules of the Senate and the House, in the laws now in operation relative to revenues and expenditures, in the organization of the Treasury Department, in the forms and method of preparation of the departmental estimates, in the method of presenting said estimates to the Congress, in the methods of accounting and audit, and such other and further information as said commission may see fit to lay before the Congress.

Sec. 4. That said commission is authorized to employ such experts and such clerical assistance as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this resolution.

Sec. 5. That the sum of \$20,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to carry out the provisions of this resolution.

Sec. 6. That said commission shall expire on the 1st day of January, 1920.

#### HUDSON RIVER TERMINAL.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 409) to consent to the proposed compact or agreement between the States of New Jersey and New York for the construction, operation, repair, and maintenance of a tunnel or tunnels under the Hudson River between the cities of Jersey City and New York, which was, on page 2, after line 10, to insert:

Sec. 3. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. EDGE. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

#### VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION OF SOLDIERS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1213) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 27, 1918, which were, on page 2, line 21, to strike out "\$75" and insert "\$80," and, on page 2, line 22, to strike out "\$75" and insert "\$100."

Mr. KENYON. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House. If this matter requires any explanation, I will say that it is the bill, passed perhaps 10 days or 2 weeks ago, with relation to vocational rehabilitation for the soldiers. The House increases the amount from \$75 per month to \$80 per month for the subsistence of single men, and increases it for married men by the same amount, \$5 a month; that is all.

Mr. KING. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. KENYON. Certainly.

Mr. KING. A Member of the House advised me last evening with respect to this matter that there was some controversy as to whether or not the appropriation carried here had not been provided for in another bill.

Mr. KENYON. Yes; I can explain that to the Senator.

Mr. KING. I was wondering if the matter had been cleared up, so that we are not duplicating the appropriation.

Mr. KENYON. I will explain it to the Senator. That was true; it was carried in the sundry civil appropriation bill. I have just come from the Appropriations Committee, of which I am a member, and the amount there has been stricken out; so it has been harmonized.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Iowa that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

#### NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. PAGE. I suppose the naval appropriation bill is now before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5608) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with amendments.

Mr. PAGE. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be read for amendment, the amendments of the committee to be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none; it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBINSON. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a privileged resolution which I submitted on yesterday and which I think will require but a short time to dispose of.

Mr. PAGE. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. ROBINSON. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

#### OBJECTIONABLE WORDS IN DEBATE.

Mr. ROBINSON. I ask the Secretary to read Senate resolution 94.

The Secretary read Senate resolution 94, submitted yesterday by Mr. ROBINSON, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the language published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Tuesday, June 24, 1919, pages 1785 and 1786, in the report of an address to the House of Representatives by the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. JOHNSON, imputing dishonorable motives and conduct to the Senator from Ohio, Mr. POMERENE, is unwarranted, unjust, and untrue, and that said language constitutes a breach of privilege and is calculated to create unfriendly relations and conditions between the House of Representatives and the Senate.

*Resolved further*, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the House of Representatives and that the House be requested to take appropriate action concerning the subject.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I ask the attention of Senators for a few moments.

On Tuesday, June 24, during the progress of debate in the House of Representatives, a Member of that body, the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. JOHNSON, made remarks attacking the character and conduct of a Member of this body. The name of the Member of this body alluded to does not appear in the RECORD, but the statements and innuendoes and clear implications of the remarks which I complain of make it patent that the allusion was to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE]. It is not my purpose to read the objectionable language uttered on the floor of the House of Representatives, but I ask Senators to refer to pages 1785 and 1786 of the RECORD of June 24 and take such notice of the language there published as they may desire.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator again give us the pages of the RECORD?

Mr. ROBINSON. Pages 1785 and 1786.

During an experience of 16 years in Congress, 10 of which were spent in the branch at the other end of the Capitol, I have never known any Member of either body to refer to a Member of the other body in such bitter, vituperative, and denunciatory language as that used by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] and which constitutes the subject matter of this resolution. The language complained of plainly disregards the rules and precedents of the House of Representatives and constitutes a grave reflection upon a Member of the Senate.

It is not pertinent here, Mr. President, at this time, in my judgment, to enter into a discussion of the merits of the legislation under consideration by the coordinate branch of Congress when the language was used by the gentleman from Kentucky. Throughout the history of the House of Representatives reference to a Senator in terms of personal criticism has been forbidden. The language referred to in this resolution can not properly be characterized as a personal criticism. It is violently abusive and denunciatory to a degree which can not be properly characterized in parliamentary language.

Jefferson's Manual, section 365, contains this precedent:

While the Senate may be referred to properly in debate, it is not in order to discuss its functions or criticize its acts.

Citing Hinds' Parliamentary Precedents, section 5114 to section 5120, inclusive—

or refer to a Senator in terms of personal criticism—

Volume 5, section 5121 to section 5122—

or read a paper making such criticism.

Volume 5, section 5128:

On one occasion while I had the honor of serving in the House of Representatives I recall an instance in which a Member addressing the Speaker used this language:

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman speaks of the Senators from—

Naming the State which the Senators represented.

Most people are trying to forget them.

The allusion, of course, was intended to be humorous. Nevertheless the Speaker very properly interposed, saying:

The gentleman will suspend. The gentleman does know, or ought to know, that his remark is against the rule of the House and is against all parliamentary usage.

On page 83, section 5126, volume 5, of Hinds' Precedents are contained synopses of several cases. In none of those instances was the language comparable in objectionable character to that to which I am referring and to which the resolution relates.

In every instance in which violation of the rule involved has been called to the attention of the other branch of Congress the Presiding Officer of that body has promptly and firmly enforced it, and enforced it with vigor.

It is proper in this connection to state that when the language referred to in the resolution was used the Speaker of the House of Representatives was not in the chair. The House

was in Committee of the Whole and had under consideration an appropriation bill, and the chair was then occupied by another Member.

I take it that any Senator who during the course of my remarks and who was not heretofore familiar with it has read the language used by the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. JOHNSON, is convinced beyond a shadow of doubt that the language is violative of those rules of parliamentary procedure which have been observed for many decades.

It only remains to be considered as to what is the proper procedure in such a case. The resolution is designed to follow the precedents. If the Presiding Officer of the other body had enforced the rule or if the matter had been called to his attention and the rules of the House had been enforced, there would have been no occasion for action on the part of the Senate.

Page 85, section 5130, volume 5, of Hinds' Parliamentary Precedents contains this citation:

It has always been considered the particular duty of the Speaker to prevent expressions offensive to the Senate or Senators.

On January 18, 1831, Mr. William D. Martin, of South Carolina, obtaining the floor for a personal explanation, called attention to the following passage in the published report of a speech made on the preceding Thursday by Mr. Churchill C. Cambreleng, of New York:

"I shall not, Mr. Speaker, travel out of my way and violate a rule of order by entering now into that discussion by examining the provisions of the Turkish treaty. Whenever I do, sir, my facts and my argument shall be founded on something more substantial than a newspaper rumor—more unquestionable than the statement of an unprincipled partisan, more unimpeachable than the evidence of a perjured Senator."

Mr. Martin said that he had occupied the chair as Speaker pro tempore when these words were uttered, but had not heard them. Had he heard them and not stopped the use of such language in reference to a Member of the other House he would have been guilty of gross misconduct as presiding officer. Therefore he made this explanation.

With reference to the question as to whether the resolution is the proper procedure, I refer to section 5126 of same volume, volume 5 of Hinds' Precedents, page 83, and read:

5126. On February 15, 1872, and April 25 of the same year, questions arose in the Senate as to the extent to which a Senator might go in replying to attacks made on him in the other House. While it was contended that a Senator attacked should not be precluded from the right of defense, the better opinion seemed to be that the parliamentary law should be adhered to, and that a resolution should be adopted bringing the matter to the attention of the other House rather than that the Senator should be allowed to reply. The question was not conclusively passed on however.

Section 5129 of the same volume contains this statement:

5129. After a speech reflecting on the character of the Senate had appeared in the RECORD, a resolution proposing an apology to the Senate was treated as a matter of privilege.

After examination by a committee, a speech reflecting on the character of the Senate was ordered to be stricken from the RECORD.

A point of order having been raised as to the privilege of the resolution, the Speaker said:

"There can be no doubt that legislative proceedings dependent upon two branches—two coordinate branches—would be very much impeded if personal and improper reflections were allowed in the one body on the Members of the other. This fact is so plain, so well established and understood that it seems unnecessary to say a word in regard to it. It is founded upon that principle which causes the Members of the House of Representatives to speak of each other and to address each other in debate by a phrase rather than by name. It is intended, as far as possible, to keep personal feeling out of public legislation, and the Chair is very glad, not only for the advantage of the relations existing between the House and Senate, but for the advantage of the relations of the Members themselves to each other and to the Chair, that this question should be passed upon in such manner as will make an impression upon us all."

The report of the committee which accompanied these resolutions declared:

"The Constitution assures to Members of the House freedom of debate. This freedom, however, like that of civil liberty, is held under well-recognized limitations, marked by rules of procedure and general parliamentary law, which are founded in reason and experience and are absolutely essential to the orderly conduct of public business."

"The coordinate branches of Congress are independent and, at the same time, interdependent—in separate action independent, in joint action interdependent. This mutual relation is such that unfriendly conditions between the two bodies must be obstructive of wise legislation and little short of a public calamity. The rules of both Houses and well-settled principles of parliamentary law alike forbid criticism of proceedings in either House by a Member of the other. Differences between the two Houses should be settled in a spirit of respectful courtesy, and when (as must frequently occur) irreconcilable, should be submitted to without recrimination."

"Applying these established principles to the speech in question it must be regarded in its references to the Senate, individually and generally, as a grave infraction of parliamentary law and an abuse of the privilege of the House. It is in spirit and substance a bitter arraignment of the Senate for an alleged failure to yield prompt assent to a measure pending therein which had passed the House."

And so forth.

Mr. President, the language which I have read, and which is contained in the Precedents of the House of Representatives, expresses better than I can in language of my own the rules which should govern the relations between these bodies. It is of the very gravest—it is of fundamental—importance, indeed, that in the debates which occur here Members of this body should not only speak respectfully of one another, but that they

should also speak respectfully of Members of the coordinate branch of Congress.

The same rule applies to the House at the other end of the Capitol. I take it for granted that had any Member of the House heard or understood the nature of the remarks uttered by the gentleman from Kentucky, remarks which violated every rule of proper parliamentary procedure, some objection would have been offered, and the correction would then have been made. I take it for granted that when the Senate by this resolution calls the attention of the House of Representatives to the matter, the Member violating its rules, doing discredit to the House and dishonor to the Senate and reflecting upon one of our most honored and worthy Members, will be required by that body to make apology for the wrong done, or if he fails or refuses to do so, that the House in its own way will take appropriate action.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, for the proper transaction of the public business nothing is more important than that the relations between the two Houses should be always within the bounds of courtesy and propriety. The protection of those relations has been recognized by all great parliamentary bodies. The history of England contains more than one case of breaches of privilege where an assault has been made by one house upon the other. Without such protection and without the observance of such rules the public business could not be carried on; the two Houses would pass from one personal brawl to another.

Mr. President, in our own Congress the House of Representatives has a rule making it out of order to attack the Senate as a body or to attack individual Senators by name or otherwise. In the Senate we have no such rule in the book; but we have an unwritten rule, which has been observed with the utmost care. Many Senators in referring to anything said in the other House will take the old formula of quoting the words as "having been uttered elsewhere." The Senate has been extremely careful in that regard. No rule could have made the practice more rigid. I have been in service here now for 32 years—6 years in the other House and 26 years in the Senate. No such case of personal attack on a Member of the other House has ever come to my knowledge. It is of no consequence whether the Senator was named or not; it was an attack upon a Senator; we know the Senator against whom it was directed. I need not say here that he is a Senator of the highest character and standing, respected and honored by all his colleagues.

This goes beyond the personal element. It is an attack on the Senate itself; it is an attack upon the Congress and upon the proper transaction of the public business. We should be derelict in our duty if we did not call the attention of the House to it.

This sort of thing in debate must not be permitted in either House. It is for the public good that I speak, wholly apart from my personal feeling, which I confess I have, owing to my friendship with the Senator from Ohio; but wholly apart from that, in the interest of good public service and proper conduct between the two Houses and the decent relations which ought to govern the transactions of this great body of Congress, this resolution ought to pass, and pass at once and unanimously.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, after the statements made by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] little need be added; but, as a member of the committee which reported to this body the bill which seems to be the object of attack and to have provoked the attack referred to, I wish to submit one or two statements.

During the last session of Congress a bill was passed by the House of Representatives which was referred to as the "anti-profiteering" bill. It came to this body and was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia. Very promptly the bill was taken up for consideration. It was referred to a subcommittee consisting of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE]; the former Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. Hollis; the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN], who is now the honored chairman of the committee; the former Senator from Delaware, Mr. Saulsbury; and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM]. That subcommittee considered the entire subject, because it was an important one at the time, and perhaps still is, in a very comprehensive and thorough way. Hearings were had, and a number of persons appeared before the subcommittee and testified with respect to the matter.

After the matter had received, as I have stated, full consideration, the Senator from Ohio was directed to be the spokesman, if I may be permitted that expression, of the subcommittee and prepare a measure embodying its views. He executed the commission and prepared a substitute bill, which was submitted to the subcommittee, who gave it their indorsement and approval. It was thereupon reported to the full committee, and,



as my recollection now serves me, it received the approval of the full committee; at any rate, it was speedily reported to this body and was promptly taken up for consideration and passed. Conferees were appointed, and the House, in the usual manner, was asked to name conferees, in order that the disagreement between the House and the Senate might be reconciled and a measure agreed upon.

Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio, the subcommittee, and the full committee brought the best light which they had to the consideration of the subject. They reported a bill which met their judgment and which received the approval of the Senate.

It is not necessary to refer to what subsequently transpired other than to say that the conferees did not meet, for reasons which the Senate will remember. The conferees of the Senate, acting upon instructions of the Senate, did not meet with the House conferees, and Congress adjourned without action being taken upon this bill.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the attack made upon the honor, integrity, and good faith of the distinguished Senator from Ohio was also an attack upon every member of the District of Columbia Committee and was an assault upon the membership of this body. It was unwarranted, it was unjustifiable, and was a violation of all parliamentary procedure.

There ought to be, and there must be, not only cordial relations but sympathetic relations between the House and the Senate in order properly to transact the important business before them. It is a matter of gratification that during this great war, when legislation of the highest importance was before the Senate and the House, the relations between these two bodies have been most cordial. Aside from this incident, I do not recall that during the past two or three years there has been any matter that has been the subject of recrimination between the two bodies, or that there has been any attack made upon the membership of either branch by Members of the other branch.

As stated by the Senator from Massachusetts, the Senator from Ohio has the confidence, the esteem, and the affection of every Member of this body. As a legislator, he stands high; as a man of character and integrity, none stands higher.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. [Putting the question.] The resolution is unanimously adopted.

#### NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. PAGE. I ask for the regular order.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5608) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. As the Chair remembers—and he thinks he is correct—it has been agreed that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with and that the bill be read for amendment, the amendments of the committee to be first considered.

Mr. PAGE. Yes; that has been agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was, under the subhead, "Pay, miscellaneous," on page 2, line 12, after the word "orders," to insert "and for traveling expenses of civilian employees"; and, on page 3, line 25, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$400,000" and insert "\$450,000," so as to read:

For commissions and interest; transportation of funds; exchange; mileage to officers while traveling under orders in the United States, and for actual personal expenses of officers while traveling abroad under orders, and for traveling expenses of civilian employees, and for mileage, at 5 cents per mile, to midshipmen entering the Naval Academy subsequent to June 1, 1919, while proceeding from their homes to the Naval Academy for examination and appointment as midshipmen; for actual traveling expenses of female nurses; actual expenses of officers while on shore patrol duty; mileage to officers of the Naval Reserve force traveling under orders of the Secretary of the Navy; hire of launches or other small boats in Asiatic waters; for rent of buildings and offices not in navy yards, including the rental of offices in the District of Columbia; expenses of courts-martial, prisoners and prisons, and courts of inquiry, boards of inspection, examining boards, with clerks, and witnesses' fees, and traveling expenses and costs; expenses of naval defense districts; stationery and recording; religious books; newspapers and periodicals for the naval service; all advertising for the Navy Department and its bureaus (except advertising for recruits for the Bureau of Navigation); copying; ferrriage; tolls; costs of suits; commissions, warrants, diplomas, and discharges; relief of vessels in distress; recovery of valuables from shipwrecks; quarantine expenses; reports; professional investigation; cost of special instruction at home and abroad, including maintenance of students and attachés: *Provided*, That this appropriation and the appropriation "Pay, Marine Corps," shall be available for special allowances for maintenance to officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps serving under unusual conditions; information from abroad and at home, and the collection and classification thereof; all charges pertaining to the Navy Department and its bureaus for ice for the cooling of drinking water on shore (except at naval hospitals), telephone rentals and tolls, telegrams, cablegrams, and postage, foreign and domestic, and post-office box

rentals; and other necessary and incidental expenses: *Provided further*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, for clerical, inspection, and messenger service in navy yards, naval stations, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, shall not exceed \$450,000, and for necessary expenses for the interned persons and prisoners of war under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department, including funeral expenses for such interned persons or prisoners of war as may die while under such jurisdiction; in all, \$5,100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

#### THE IRISH QUESTION.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, while I am very much interested in the naval bill and do not desire to occupy the Senate on matters that do not pertain to it, still, in view of the fact that remarks were made yesterday which require answer, in my judgment, I ask the indulgence of the Senate for a very short period.

It is unfortunate that a thoughtful consideration of the Irish question should be marred by politics. It has been the policy of our Government from the beginning to express sympathy with the people of the world in their struggle for liberty and the realization of American ideals of government. In 1793 we requested France to release Gen. Lafayette from imprisonment. In 1851 Hungary declared for a republic and made Kossuth governor. Although our relations with Austria were friendly, we practically recognized the republic and rescued Kossuth from Austrian vengeance and brought him to the United States on an American warship, and a joint resolution was passed by the Senate and House cordially welcoming Kossuth to this country. In 1867 we interposed in Mexico, a friendly Government, in behalf of clemency for Maximilian. We protested to Spain, a friendly Government, in 1857 and again in 1897, in behalf of Cuban revolutionists. In 1867 we made representations to England in behalf of Irish political prisoners in England and in Canada, irrespective of the fact whether or not they were citizens.

Daniel Webster in his great Senate speech on Grecian independence against Turkish oppression stated that action should be based upon our own duty, our character, and our own interests as one of the free States of the world, and our obligation toward "those great principles which have hitherto maintained the relative independence of nations and which have more especially made her (America) what she is."

Woodrow Wilson has taken the same stand in laying down his 14 points, which he has epitomized in these words, "A reign of law with the consent of the governed and sustained by the organized opinion of mankind." He has also said that "no people should be forced under a sovereignty under which they do not wish to live." The project of a league of nations was, among other things, designed to maintain the independence of small States which have been established as the result of our successful war against autocracy. I am sure that he has been the spokesman for the small nations before the conference, and I am sure also that his sympathies are with Irish aspirations for a self-determined government. His paternal ancestors came from Ireland. I have heard from his own lips warm expressions of concern for her welfare, and that was when he accepted a statue of Robert Emmet, the Irish martyr and patriot, who died in seeking the independence of his country.

Any reasonable man, however, must appreciate the fact that in creating independent States in Europe and in endowing them with self-determination the conference at Paris necessarily confined itself only to the territory which had been as the result of war wrested from the enemy. England, France, Italy, and Japan, and even the United States, hold under their control several of the small countries of the world. Consistently with their principles the "Big Five" should open the doors to a policy of self-determination. But this is also a question of practical statesmanship. There are backward nations and nations fully qualified for self-government. The United States, for instance, has been educating the Philippine people in self-government in anticipation of their ultimate independence. England has some backward peoples in her Empire, but she has also self-governing colonies, like Australia, Canada, and New Zealand, which have as large a measure of independence apparently as they desire. Ireland has all the indicia of nationality and all the qualifications for independence, and for that reason the President, necessarily in a diplomatic way, has interested British statesmen in her cause. He can not demand that one of the Allies submit itself now to the conference without breaking up the conference. He has to proceed with tact and caution in order to preserve the Entente.

The World War, which dismembered the Germanic and Austro-Hungarian Empires, required the conference to immediately create new and independent States, which were without government or organization, and this principle having been estab-

lished with the conclusion of the peace and the establishment of a league of nations will pave the way to Irish independence. England will have less reluctance to give Ireland self-determination when she is thoroughly committed to the principle by the action of the conference with respect to other small States, and when under article 10 of the covenant she will be assured that the league of nations will prevent Ireland from being used as a base of operations by an enemy. Ireland herself, once free, will have no incentive to permit the trespass of a foreign power on her soil. She would join the league and would thus be protected without raising an army or a navy against external aggression. When free the logic of the situation will bring about a close commercial union between England and Ireland, because England is Ireland's nearest and best market.

Some persons interested in the cause have objected to article 10 because they fear it would guarantee the territorial integrity of the British Empire. This it does only with respect to "external aggression." Now, Irish independence can be won either by the voluntary act of England, a successful revolution, or the intervention by a superior force from the outside. Of these three avenues to independence the league only stands in the way of the last, namely, "external aggression." If Irish independence was won by another nation for her, a service which some radicals expected from Germany, she would have no reason to expect independence as a free gift. Germany would have made her a fortified island and administered her government doubtless with Prussian military severity. Desirable as Irish independence is, I do not know of any country that would go to war with England for the mere purpose of liberating Ireland, but if any country went to war with England, as, for instance, the United States, which would mean the disruption of the league of nations and with it the guaranties of territorial integrity, then, in the event of a successful outcome, the United States doubtless would give Ireland independence. It can not be possible that the Irish people would consciously seek to prevent the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means, and thus avert war, in order that Ireland might profit by conflict, which, when it comes, will be more terrible and destructive than the one through which we have just passed.

If an Irishman tells me that he would put Irish independence before the spectacle of a world bathed again in blood, the loss again of millions of lives, and the hunger, disease, privations, sufferings, and torture inflicted upon millions more, then I would say he is less humane and more selfish than the world believes. The business of the conference was to establish peace and by every means possible to avert war in the future. But that is the question.

There is one thing certain, that there shall be no peace for England until Ireland is made free, because, as was said of the Romans, "What part of the world is not full of their labors?" The Irish line is flung around the world, and the insistent demand of Irishmen and lovers of freedom everywhere will compel the blunderers of Downing Street to yield to a world-wide demand based upon world-wide principles which the conference and the league have established. Bear in mind the league consists of a union of free nations, and if England does not yield to the absolutely logical case of Ireland and give her the decision then the Irish justifiably will expose England to every disadvantage in peace and in war throughout the world. From the days of the American Revolution England has been held strictly to account by America, and it would need less weight than the Irish to throw the scales of judgment against her whenever a conflict should arise. Before we entered the war we were on the very verge of a conflict with England by reason of her own acts interfering with our trade and opening the mails of our merchants.

Therefore since Ireland can not release herself from the English yoke nor expect any other nation to do so, the public opinion of the world and her own resolution firmly held may accomplish it sooner than we expect. It would be the wisest policy for England.

The right of revolution is not denied by the league; and, apart from this, the importance of the league to Ireland may be understood when I state that the Irish volunteers at the end of the eighteenth century, when England was engaged in foreign wars, established an Irish Parliament which endured for 18 years, when England, free from other engagements, abolished it. If Ireland wins independence now and joins the league, the warlike power of England can not be used against her. If there is no league, what is to prevent England from reconquering Ireland whenever her interest dictates such a course?

This is a grave question, worthy of very careful consideration before decision is finally made. Ireland fears the guarantee of territorial integrity will prevent her from securing outside

help, for which she has vainly looked for centuries and which England has, without a league, been able to repeal. So the failure of the league would not necessarily bring independence any closer to Ireland.

On the other hand, if Ireland wins independence by the moral pressure of the world and her own steadfast purpose to be free, the league will insure her in her freedom.

Once established, the principles of the league, whose chief advocate was President Wilson, and which England has reluctantly accepted, become an accusing arraignment against England until she accords self-determination to the best qualified of her dependencies.

England's title to Ireland is by conquest, and for 700 years Ireland has never acquiesced, but protested with the lives of her people. The men who died on Easter Sunday, 1916—poets, philosophers, and scholars—have, in common with martyrs of other days, kept alive the case of Ireland before the world. To remind the present generation of British oppression against which Irish protest was made, let me quote Mr. Gladstone, who has said:

The relations of England with Ireland have, as a whole, been more profoundly disgraced by cruelty and fraud than those between any other nations in the entire history of Christendom.

James Bryce says:

They saw Irish manufactures destroyed for the sake of English manufacturers; Irish revenues jobbed away for measures too disreputable even for the corrupt England of that day. England did nothing for Ireland and suffered her to do nothing for herself. Thus at last the natural forces that make for freedom asserted themselves.

To-day, out of this country, consisting of 32,000 square miles and 4,000,000 of population, it is said that England takes \$150,000,000 in revenue annually. Ireland is larger in area and population than either Belgium, Holland, Denmark, or Switzerland, and raises more than three times as much revenue as any of them. She has a race, language, and history of her own, and is in every essential particular a nation to-day fit to assume the duties of nationhood and should be so recognized by the nations of the world. England, however, bars the way; and, as I have said, Ireland will either have to win her own independence, have England concede it, or have some other country win it and present it as a free and unconditional gift.

When Daniel Webster was asked in the course of debate in the Senate whether he expected to win Grecian independence from Turkey by the force of American arms, he said, "No; but that the public opinion of the world, led by America, would ultimately effectuate Grecian independence." President Woodrow Wilson and the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States have already invoked this moral power. The President has had a most difficult position, sympathizing, as he does, with Ireland, because he has been dealing with England to effect a matter of much greater importance than Irish independence, namely, the peace of the world, the establishment of free States out of conquered territory, and the abolition of war.

Why should Woodrow Wilson be singled out by Irish radicals who have assumed to lead us in this movement? Why have the political managers of one political party been allowed to claim a political advantage for the Senate resolution? I recall that in 1916 the following mild resolution, based on established precedents, was proposed in the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Senate expresses the hope that the British Government may exercise clemency in the treatment of Irish political prisoners; and that the President be requested to transmit this resolution to that Government.

The Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate rejected it, but three members of that committee submitted it as a minority report. These Senators happened to be all Democrats—Messrs. Stone, Pittman, and O'Gorman. The resolution was adopted by 46 yeas, of which number there were only 8 Republicans, 2 regular and 6 progressive. Of the 19 nays there were only 3 Democrats. I think that vote was a real test of party predilection and sentiment. The other day, on the Borah-Walsh resolution, asking that the Irish delegates be heard, and expressing sympathy for Irish aspirations for a government of their own choice, a much stronger resolution, practically addressed to England, there was substantial unanimity. Only one dissenting vote was recorded, and that was by a Democrat who has consistently on all occasions voted against measures of this kind. Why on this occasion was the Republican membership of this body solidified? It was under the pressure of party discipline and intended, I believe, to embarrass the President, who, as I have explained, was in a very difficult situation serving his country and humanity. It was also done, I believe, to defeat the league of nations by exciting a false suspicion that article 10 prevented internal revolution. It is unfortunate that so great and worthy a cause should be so used as a means of winning votes by men whose previous action would indicate that they



have no real sympathy with Ireland and whose main contention in all the debate is that America should stay at home and leave Europe to its fate.

I beg to say, in conclusion, that in conversation recently with President Ramon De Valera, of the Irish Republic, he emphatically declared that he trusted the holy cause to which he had pledged his life and honor would not be dragged into the mire of American party politics, but that the entire American Nation, with one acclaim, pursuant to its immemorial principles, might declare for the freedom of a brave and generous people. He had in mind the services which the Irish race had rendered America, and he might have recalled the appeal which the Continental Congress made, and did not make in vain, in an address inspired by Benjamin Franklin, "To the people of Ireland," July 28, 1775, as follows:

We are desirous of the good opinion of the virtuous and humane; we are peculiarly desirous of furnishing you with the true state of our motives and objects. . . . You have ever been friendly to the rights of mankind and we acknowledge with pleasure and gratitude that your nation has produced patriots who have nobly distinguished themselves in the cause of humanity and of America.

In response to this appeal Pitt declared, "Ireland is with America to a man." The mission of Franklin to Ireland was realized.

The public opinion now of the United States stands firmly, without party props, on the foundation of gratitude, justice, and the enduring principles of free and self-determined government.

Mr. President, as part of my speech I ask permission to have printed in the RECORD an editorial on this subject and the declaration of Ireland's independence.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The matter referred to is as follows:

IRELAND'S DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE, PROCLAIMED BY THE DAIL EIREANN IN DUBLIN, JANUARY 21, 1919.

Whereas the Irish people is by right a free people; and  
Whereas for 700 years the Irish people has never ceased to repudiate and has repeatedly protested in arms against foreign usurpation; and  
Whereas English rule in this country is and always has been based upon force and fraud and maintained by military occupation against the declared will of the people; and  
Whereas the Irish Republic was proclaimed in Dublin on Easter Monday, 1916, by the Irish Republican Army, acting on behalf of the Irish people; and  
Whereas the Irish people is resolved to secure and maintain its complete independence in order to promote the common weal, to re-establish justice, to provide for future defense, to insure peace at home and good will with all nations, and to constitute a national policy based upon the people's will, with equal right and equal opportunity for every citizen; and  
Whereas at the threshold of a new era in history the Irish electorate has in the general election of December, 1918, seized the first occasion to declare by an overwhelming majority its firm allegiance to the Irish Republic:

Now, therefore, we, the elected representatives of the ancient Irish people, in national parliament assembled, do, in the name of the Irish nation, ratify the establishment of the Irish Republic and pledge ourselves and our people to make this declaration effective by every means at our command.

To ordain that the elected representatives of the Irish people alone have power to make laws binding on the people of Ireland, and that the Irish parliament is the only parliament to which that people will give its allegiance.

We solemnly declare foreign government in Ireland to be an invasion of our national right which we will never tolerate, and we demand the evacuation of our country by the English garrison.

We claim for our national independence the recognition and support of every free nation of the world, and we proclaim that independence to be a condition precedent to international peace hereafter.

In the name of the Irish people we humbly commit our destiny to Almighty God, who gave our fathers the courage and determination to persevere through centuries of a ruthless tyranny, and, strong in the justice of the cause which they have handed down to us, we ask His divine blessing on this, the last stage of the struggle which we have pledged ourselves to carry through to freedom.

CAN IRELAND STAND ALONE?

This question can be best answered by comparing Ireland with the other small nations of Europe:

	Size.
Area in square miles:	
Belgium	11,373
Holland	12,582
Denmark	15,042
Switzerland	15,976
Ireland	32,531

Countries about the same size as Ireland are: Serbia, 33,891 square miles; Portugal, 35,490; Greece, 41,933; and Bulgaria, 43,305.

	Population.
Norway	2,396,782
Denmark	2,940,990
Switzerland	3,888,990
Ireland	4,390,219

Countries whose respective populations are slightly in excess of Ireland's: Serbia, 4,547,000; Bulgaria, 4,751,000; Greece, 4,821,300. (Ireland's population in 1846 was 8,500,000.)

What have these other small nations paid normally to run their business?

Annual bills.

Serbia	\$26,250,000
Greece	27,000,000
Switzerland	35,000,000
Bulgaria	35,000,000
Norway	36,200,000
Denmark	47,500,000
British rule now costs Ireland	200,000,000

All the small powers mentioned have maintained their own governments, their own armies, and three of them have fleets as well. It is cheaper to be free than in slavery.

Liberty has cost only \$6 per capita per annum in Greece and Serbia, \$7.50 in Bulgaria, \$9 in Switzerland, \$13 in Sweden, \$14 in Portugal, \$15 in Norway, while in Ireland subjection to British militarism costs \$44 per capita per annum.

Ireland is large enough, populous enough, and rich enough to stand alone, and, judged by any standard, is admirably fitted for freedom.

[Reprinted from the Newark (N. J.) News.]

IRELAND AND THE LEAGUE.

If the views of many Irish-Americans on the Irish question have become more radical in recent months this is not surprising. Many who were merely home rulers a short time ago advocate complete independence to-day. Sir Horace Plunkett commented on the remarkable revival of interest here in the Irish problem. Incidentally, he revealed that his own opinions have changed. His views to-day are far from the views he held when he wrote "Ireland in the Nineteenth Century."

The views of the men who have organized the new center party in Ireland have changed. These centrists were largely Unionists, opposed to broad home rule or home rule at all. Stephen Gwynn, the chairman of the new party, was a home ruler, but here is Gen. Hubert Gough, who resigned his army commission when Mr. Asquith threatened to enforce home rule, affiliated with the new party and declaring that the greatest need of Ireland is self-government. The secretary of the new party is a brother of a Carsonite member of Parliament.

Opinion has moved ahead on both sides of the Atlantic. But some of the most eloquent pleaders for the Irish cause should stop to consider the wisdom of linking their campaign with opposition to the league of nations.

Their opposition to the league is based on that article of the covenant which says other members of the league shall undertake to preserve the territory of any one of them against "external aggression." They interpret this to mean that the United States, as a member of the league, would be compelled to go to the aid of England in case of an uprising in Ireland. Of course it means nothing of the kind. A rebellion in Ireland would not be "external aggression." Words mean what they say, as President Lowell would put it.

A league of nations can not injure the Irish cause. Can it be of any benefit to the Irish cause?

Absolute home rule has been opposed by leaders of Tory opinion in England almost as keenly as Irish independence is opposed and, from their viewpoint, logically so. The argument of the Tory, and even of many who are not Tories, has always been that an independent Ireland would expose England to foreign attack and aggression from the west. That argument vanishes the moment a league of nations is established. It will have thereafter no force. That very article of the covenant in which certain Irish-Americans profess to see a menace to Ireland actually buttresses the Irish case for self-government. Article 10 of the covenant pulls the chief contention against Irish self-government from beneath the British feet.

Suppose rebellion actually occurred in Ireland. How long would it be before an instrumentality like the league of nations would step in to mediate? The moral force of the civilized world would ultimately interfere, not to crush the rebels but to give them a hearing before all mankind; not to protect Britain, indeed, but to save the revolutionists. On the other hand, if the rebels were succeeding, a public opinion, born of human nature itself, would not permit interference.

To put it very baldly, suppose Russia in time becomes a member of the league of nations. Her pet hate, whether justly or unjustly, is Britain. Germany will be a member of the league of nations. Is it to be presumed that she will be very partial to England? And what about the Scandinavian nations? And Spain? And in the United States, what an engulfing sentiment would arise to exert moral pressure on Britain in case of an Irish revolution! Ireland might indeed covet the opportunity to take her case to the court of the league of nations. Without a league, where could she successfully appeal? Nowhere, with hope of action. It can never be called an impertinence for a league of nations to take up the Irish question, or for one or more members of the league to press for such consideration. That is very different from taking it up in the peace conference.

The league of nations is the substitute for imperialism. It is the death knell of imperialism. And imperialism is the idea that has kept self-government from Ireland. If there shall be no league of nations, what will happen to those German colonies? Into whose lap will they fall? Imperialism will continue to grow fat if there is no league of nations. And the day of self-government for countries like Ireland will be delayed.

The new center party in Ireland demands control of excise and customs duties by an Irish Parliament. That is, it wants a Canadian home rule. Home rule on Canadian lines is surely the minimum to-day. Which will mean, again, Irish membership in the league of nations.

It is strange to hear friends of Ireland denouncing the league as an eternal barrier to Ireland's hope when it is exactly the opposite. It is strange to see these men occupying the same position toward the league as do some traditional Anglophiles who have suddenly evinced a brand-new suspicion of the motives of John Bull. It is odd to observe the Irish World and the Gaelic American making common cause with George Harvey's Weekly, the New York Sun, and the New York Tribune.

Truly the world is out of joint. But probably the overwhelming majority of Irish-Americans are doing their own thinking on this question and are not going to be persuaded by false prophets. That Ireland stands a better chance of attaining self-government in a world with a league of nations than in a world without a league of nations is as clear as daylight.

PROPOSED SALE OF GOVERNMENT SHIPS.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, if any one fact has been clearly demonstrated by our experience in this war—and I think many have been demonstrated—it is that merchant ships are essential to create an adequate Navy; in other words, that

merchant ships are as important as battle cruisers. It is in that connection that I desire to submit some observations at this point, not entirely inappropriate, I think, to the general subject of the Navy.

Mr. President, on the 24th of June I offered the following resolution:

*Resolved*, That in the judgment of the Senate it is not advisable for the United States Shipping Board to sell at this time any of the merchant ships of the Government to foreign interests unless it be such as can not be successfully employed here.

*Resolved further*, That efficient merchant ships of the Government should not be sold at all at this time, except such ships as are undesirable for overseas trade and will bring approaching their actual cost or more, and then only with a view of replacing them with better ships and in order to properly balance the fleet.

I was somewhat influenced to offer that resolution by an article appearing in the Washington Times of June 17, 1917, entitled:

UNITED STATES SELLS 19 STEEL SHIPS.

Nineteen steel steamships have been sold to New York purchasers for \$27,821,120, Chairman Hurley, of the United States Shipping Board, announces. Names of the purchasers, which include several big shipping concerns, will be announced later.

Also by articles which were quite generally published throughout the country in various newspapers, practically to the same effect, one of which, as a sample, is quoted as follows:

BOARD TO SELL MORE THAN 2,000 SHIPS—EMERGENCY FLEET CORPORATION WILL DISPOSE OF 2,424 VESSELS OF VARIOUS TYPES; PRICE TO RANGE FROM \$210 TO \$225 A TON; OFFICE OPENED IN NEW YORK—GOVERNMENT'S TERMS TO PROSPECTIVE BUYERS.

NEW YORK, June 21.

The United States Shipping Board will open an office here Monday for the sale of the entire 2,424 ships of various types owned by the Emergency Fleet Corporation. The price will be from \$210 to \$225 a ton, depending upon the type.

The announcement of the sale was made here to-day by John E. Barber, assistant to Edward N. Hurley, chairman of the Shipping Board, and who has been advising the American delegation at the peace conference on shipping matters. Mr. Barber, who will be in charge of the sale, said that time payments would be allowed. Twenty-five per cent of the purchase price must be paid on the day of the sale, 12½ per cent at the end of six months, and a similar amount at the end of the year. The balance of 50 per cent is to be paid within four years.

The foregoing clippings suggest that a definite policy should be determined upon with reference to our ships, and that Congress should enact legislation to carry out that policy.

It is true the Commerce Committee, during the last session, gave hearings extending almost throughout the session, often several days a week, inquiring into the shipbuilding program and the work of the Shipping Board and Emergency Fleet Corporation. The primary purpose was to be helpful to these agencies in carrying on their very vital and stupendous undertakings. We realized the great responsibilities resting upon these agencies of the Government and the importance of their tasks. The need for ships is fully recognized, and it is unnecessary to dwell upon the essential and vital nature of the work before these organizations—the Fleet Corporation being the constructing body and the Shipping Board the supervising and operating body, speaking generally.

We found there had been delays in getting the construction of ships under way.

There was delay in organizing the board, to begin with.

The stupendous character of the enterprise made it necessary to first organize an efficient working force.

The novelty of the undertaking necessitated weeks and weeks of time to gather information and lay out the plans.

1. There was delay in preparing the designs for ships, and particularly caused by numerous changes in the designs, even after contracts were let.

2. Settling matters of private contracts and taking over ships on the ways.

3. Controversy about material—steel, wood, and concrete.

4. Finding labor in adequate quantity and sufficiently skilled.

5. Transportation arrangements—for material and for men as well.

6. Housing facilities were lacking.

7. Finding a general manager and other qualified officers.

8. Lack of coal interfered with operations.

As promptly as the committee could discover any condition holding back the program we at once proceeded to endeavor to remedy it.

We reported, and Congress passed, and the President approved measures—

1. To provide for housing ship workers.

2. To commandeer transportation lines when necessary to get the workers to and from the yards.

We also urged the provisions in the measure reported by the Committee on Military Affairs providing for commandeering timber in certain circumstances.

We found contracts were being made with parties operating yards—some 64 steel yards, 420 ways, and additional wooden yards on the Atlantic, Gulf, Pacific, and Great Lakes.

Advances were made by the Government for building yards in most instances.

There are three yards which the Government has the option to purchase, and which are designated as agency yards—meaning they are operated under the supervision of the Fleet Corporation, the contractors being agents of the corporation and receiving a fixed fee for each vessel, the corporation paying for the material and labor employed, the contractors having charge of the work. They were known as the Hog Island Yard, near Philadelphia, contractor, American International Shipbuilding Corporation; the yard at Newark, N. J., Submarine Boat Co., contractor, and the yard at Bristol, Pa., the Merchants Co., contractor.

The contracts were practically the same to begin with, but on recommendation of the Shipping Board and Mr. Schwab, the Submarine Boat Co. contract has been modified, so that they furnish all labor and material and build the boats for a fixed price.

The yard at Bristol (Merchants Shipbuilding Corporation) has 12 ways.

The yard at Newark Bay (Submarine Boat Co.) has 28 ways.

The yard at Hog Island (American International Shipbuilding Corporation) has 50 ways.

Contracts call for—

Merchants, 60 ships, 9,900 dead-weight tonnage each.

Submarine Boat, 150 ships, 5,075 dead-weight tonnage each.

American International (Hog Island), 120 originally, 60 added, making 180 ships, 110 class A, 7,500 tons each, and 70 class B, 8,000 tons each.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. KING. I notice in the statement just made by the Senator that a fixed price was made for some ships. Is that rigid, so that after the armistice, and particularly now, when prices have fallen somewhat, the same price is paid for a ship that was paid during the peak of high prices? There ought to be some flexibility, it seems to me.

Mr. FLETCHER. The contract of the Submarine Boat Co., to which I referred, was originally based upon the cost of construction plus fees, which make what may be called a cost-plus contract. That contract was afterwards changed so as to call for the contractor to furnish labor and material and to be paid so much for the building of the ships. I take it that the contracts cover the entire number of ships that they were to build. I will show a little later how many have been constructed and how many still remain to be built by the Submarine Boat Co. There are a few contracts similar to that elsewhere. In most instances the Emergency Fleet Corporation have reserved the right to cancel contracts, and they have canceled a number of contracts, especially where the keels have not been laid and the materials have not all been put on the ground and work ready to be begun. If it is more profitable for the Government to cancel those contracts, the Shipping Board has undertaken to do it, and in that case the contractor must be compensated for his loss, whatever it may be.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. FLETCHER. Certainly.

Mr. KING. One reason why I make the inquiry is because several complaints—perhaps that is too strong a term—several statements have been made to me by persons who are somewhat interested in the construction of ships, and they have stated that because of the rigid and inflexible contracts which the Government has with various individuals, under which the same prices are paid now that were paid when prices were at the highest limit, it is difficult to get contracts or to do anything for the reason that that set the pace and maintained the high level of wages and the price of everything connected with the ships.

They thought it was very unfortunate and would make for high prices in the construction of vessels and prevent private individuals from embarking upon the construction of ships who would be willing to do so if there were competition in the market, so as to permit it to seek its own level.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think the Shipping Board realize that situation, and, instead of endeavoring to keep the cost up to the peak to which the Senator has referred, they are endeavoring to bring it down to the proper basis to-day. They estimate that the cost to-day would be less than the high cost which they have paid in the past by some \$50 a ton, as I recall it. The effort is to bring the industry on that level and away from the high peak of cost which it was necessary to pay when they had to build, sacrificing economy to speed. I believe now there is no difficulty in getting contracts in competition upon a fair basis.

The committee favored keeping the Hog Island yard down to 32 ways for the present, but the Fleet Corporation authorized completion of all the ways originally contemplated and directed



that 50 be finished. The Fleet Corporation also added 60 ships to the number—120—originally contracted for; so that this yard has been completed, 50 ways are in full operation, 22 ships built there have been delivered, and 34 ships launched. They are now launching three 7,500-ton steel ships every two weeks.

There are now being delivered to the Shipping Board four steel ships a day.

Contracts were let for a number of wooden ships, usually 3,500 tons, Ferris type. Fifty-eight of the composite type were ordered. They are usually classed as wooden.

Of these contracts there were canceled aggregating 1,437,000 tons.

Two hundred and thirty-seven of these wooden (including a small number of composite) ships are now being operated by the Shipping Board.

Two hundred and fifty are being built.

It is a question whether some of these may not be changed to barges or sailers.

One reinforced-concrete ship is being operated, and eight are being built as tankers.

I feel quite confident, after a careful inspection of the work, that these reinforced-concrete ships will be in every way successful, and that it will be found advisable and profitable to build more of them. In some respects they will have many advantages over any other type.

Of the wooden ships, 38 have been sold at an average price of \$122 per ton, whereas they cost practically \$200. They operate to Japan and across the Atlantic, as well as to near-by ports.

A later report is contained in the New York Journal of Commerce, which I will ask to have go in the Record and will refer to later.

Since the armistice the board has canceled contracts calling for 3,937,000 dead-weight tons, of which about two and one-half million were steel and the remainder wood.

The keels were not laid when they were canceled for about 3,500,000 tons of these cancellations.

The existing contracts and completed ships will aggregate about 13,000,000 dead-weight tons.

Among the canceled contracts are 35 transports at Hog Island yard and 20 ships of the Bristol (Merchants) yard.

The Shipping Board is now operating 965 ships of all classes, making 5,467,105 dead-weight tons, the property of the Government.

Some of the ships owned by the Government are operated by the Army and some by the Navy.

Our tonnage stands now—owned by the United States—6,544,832.

We may classify the ships in operation now by us as follows:

	Dead-weight tons.
1. American-owned ships taken over for the war	1,272,518
2. Foreign ships chartered	691,736
3. Foreign ships requisitioned (Dutch)	461,731
4. Captured enemy ships (ex-German)	610,112
5. Captured enemy ships (ex-Austrian)	45,453
6. Ships built since the outbreak of the war by the Emergency Fleet Corporation	3,543,335

Mr. RANSDELL. Will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. FLETCHER. I will.

Mr. RANSDELL. I am intensely interested in what the Senator is saying. I am anxious to know whether the figures he has just given include the ships engaged in the coastwise commerce on our Gulf and the two oceans and also the coastwise commerce on the Great Lakes?

Mr. FLETCHER. No; I am not dealing with our coastwise shipping at all.

Mr. RANSDELL. It is foreign-borne commerce of which you are speaking?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes.

Mr. RANSDELL. Then we have a very considerable additional ocean tonnage which is engaged in the coastwise business?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes; American owned, but not owned by the Shipping Board.

Mr. RANSDELL. American owned and operated?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes.

Mr. RANSDELL. Both on the Great Lakes and on the ocean?

Mr. FLETCHER. Precisely. That amounts, I think, to somewhere between six and eight million tons.

Mr. RANSDELL. That is in addition to the overseas commerce of which you are speaking, which is not coastwise?

Mr. FLETCHER. Precisely.

Mr. LENROOT. The 965 ships include all the ships operated by the Government, whether engaged in coastwise commerce or not?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes; they do. Of course the Government has the right to employ them in the coastwise trade, and in a

few instances there may be a little coastwise business done, but the shipping of which I speak is separate from our coastwise shipping, which, of course, is under the American flag and American owned, but not by the Government.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator permit a further interruption?

Mr. FLETCHER. Certainly.

Mr. KING. The Senator stated that we have requisitioned a number of Dutch ships, aggregating over 400,000 tons, and that we have taken over private ships aggregating one million three hundred thousand and odd tons. Is there any purpose upon the part of the Emergency Fleet Corporation or the Shipping Board to restore to Holland the ships taken from her and to private individuals the ships which were commandeered from them, and if so, when will they be restored?

Mr. FLETCHER. I think arrangements have about been completed with reference to the Dutch ships. I think they will go back to their original owners very shortly under a satisfactory plan that has been practically agreed upon. That is my information. As to the American-owned ships taken over by the Government during the war, to which the Senator refers, many of those were actually bought and paid for by the Government. I do not mean by that that they are privately owned ships just commandeered for use during the war, but they were ships on the stocks uncompleted and contracted for by private individuals, and the Government took them over and finished them, of course, and paid the original owners for them. Those ships will undoubtedly remain a part of the Government property.

Mr. LENROOT. It is true, is it not, that we are, however, still operating privately owned ships to a considerable degree which will be turned back as soon as plans can be made for that purpose?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes; that is true; we have some Norwegian ships chartered and a few others. I know, however, that some of our ships, particularly two ships that we acquired from the transcontinental railroads—the *Great Northern* and the *Northern Pacific*—were paid for, and we own them, and they are operated by the Army and probably will be retained by the Army.

Referring now to the Shipping Board, it has been operating ships since January 1, 1919. It has built up an organization with a director of operations at the head, assistant director, with various departments and divisions, and 2,400 employees, and an annual pay roll of \$332,699.50.

It has received a total revenue of \$386,126,391.59.

Operating expenses, insurance, and depreciation (10 per cent on steel and 12 per cent on wood), \$344,581,738.18.

The usual estimate for depreciation is only 5 per cent instead of 10 per cent. This deduction is excessive as to both wood and steel.

Earnings over expenses, insurance, and depreciation, \$41,544,653.41.

If you deduct interest at 5 per cent on the investment in the ships, placing the value for this purpose of the wooden ship at \$100 a ton and the steel ship at \$200 a ton, giving a total of \$913,541,252, you would reduce the earnings by \$27,235,478.21, and leave a net revenue earned by the Government since January 1, 1919, over and above all expense of operation, depreciation—estimated as stated—and insurance and interest on investment, \$16,453,361.83.

A number of the best ships—most profitable to operate, 193, have been in the service of the Army. To keep these ships busy and take care of the increase, now coming out at the rate of four each day, will require a considerable organization and capable, experienced officials, and an efficient force. Existing rates will come down, but for some time to come they will be much higher than prewar rates. There will be work for the ships and a pressing demand for carriers for an indefinite period, not ending in the very near future. The proceeds of Liberty bonds, held by the people, are in these ships. Now is the time to earn the interest on these bonds and lay up a surplus for the principal, and at the same time take care of the commerce of the United States and open up the routes of trade, ready and waiting for development.

We are in position to do this with our own carriers, owned by the people of this country.

It is a colossal business, but is it not a reflection on the Government to hold that on that account it can not be managed by the Government?

Is it not rather more reasonable to contend that because of its hugeness private enterprise can not be found strong enough to perform it.

THE NEED OF SHIPS.

Let us go back a little.

In 1620 there were about 40 ships in the trade between England and Massachusetts Bay. They were wooden sailboats of

about 35 tons. The freight rate was £3 per ton; passengers were carried at £5 each and horses at £10 each.

New England began to build ships—about 100-ton ships—at a cost of £4 per ton.

Virginia gave a subsidy of tobacco in Colonial days to induce her people to build ships, and they built one.

At the close of the Revolutionary War our population was scattered along the Atlantic coast from Maine to Georgia and westward to the Mississippi River, and, including slaves, aggregated about 3,500,000 people. The most populous States were Virginia, Massachusetts, and Pennsylvania. The largest city was Philadelphia, which boasted a population of 42,520. New York came next, then Boston, then Charleston, S. C., and, fifth, Baltimore.

For exports the Southern States produced tobacco, rice, and indigo and had relatively few ships.

The only means for transporting freight was by boats.

At Jamestown the colonists built shallops of 12 or 13 tons burden in 1611. The first seagoing vessel built in the United States for commercial uses was constructed in Maine in 1607. She was named *Virginia* and of the size of 32 tons.

The first American shipyard was built on the Mystic River, where Medford now stands, in 1630.

At the outset Congress was powerless to do anything; in fact, it was said Congress "could not even pay the rent of the hall hired for their meeting."

In 1789 there were 19 shipbuilders in Philadelphia, and they built only about 1,500 tons a year.

All American trade with the West Indies was forbidden by the British.

The whalers of Nantucket took steps to remove their industry to France.

All that portion of the United States west of the Appalachians the French and Spanish were united in an effort to cut off.

At this period our merchantmen reached out for the trade of the Far East.

In a letter of December 23, 1783, appearing in the *Journal of Congress* (1784, p. 333), Daniel Parker stated that a ship called the *Empress of China*, under command of Capt. John Green, would shortly sail from New York to Canton, in China, and requested "sea letters." This ship measured 360 tons. She sailed February 22, 1784, carrying outgoing cargo of ginseng, and she brought back tea and silk, making a profit in the venture of \$30,000, a little more than 25 per cent on the investment.

She was soon joined by the *Experiment*, a vessel carrying 80 tons of cargo. Her crew numbered 15 men and boys and she carried 6 cannon and a supply of small arms.

Notwithstanding these conditions, and although the return voyage required 4 months and 12 days, the business was profitable, so that in 1789 no less than 15 American ships were in the Canton roads, carrying ginseng, fish, flour, butter, rum, wines, beer, and snuff, and bringing back principally tea and silk.

Just think of these small boats, the long voyages over unexplored seas, along uncharted coasts, carrying a flag which represented no power, when our people were financially prostrate and leading commercial nations were secretly or openly at enmity with us; yet these sturdy pioneers reached out for the commerce of all the East. They had the stuff in them that makes sea power, and boys became commanders of ships before they were of age.

By 1815 the United States had about half the tonnage of Great Britain, and by 1850 we had 3,535,454 tons, while Great Britain had only 4,232,960. Our shipping continued to grow, and by 1861 the difference between us was reduced to about 400,000 tons, Great Britain showing 5,895,369 tons, the United States 5,482,127 tons.

The war between the States came.

The steel ships came.

Our people seemed to lose interest in shipping—attracted in other directions.

When the war of 1914 burst forth we had 4,000,000 tons of overseas shipping in foreign trade less than we had in 1861.

We could only claim of such shipping about 1,400,000 tons. It is true American interests owned foreign shipping to the extent of about 2,000,000 tons, which served our commerce, being under American management though under foreign flag.

Great Britain owned about one-half the world's carriers of overseas commerce of 43,054,000 gross tons.

Only about 9.7 per cent of our foreign trade was carried in American bottoms. This was a dangerous as well as humiliating and inexcusable situation in which to find ourselves.

Of course, when German and Austrian ships of about 6,000,000 and 1,000,000 tons, respectively, were out of commission Italy's and France's ships were confined to their own business, and Great Britain requisitioned many merchant ships for war purposes,

we began to realize what a perilous state of dependency we were in. Of course, freight rates went up to prohibitive points, as high as 1,000 per cent, and our products weighed down our terminals and packed our warehouses, with no means of getting them to their waiting markets.

We became a beggar of ships, "a fettered and embargoed trafficker on the seas."

We passed the shipping act, which we ought to have done years before.

There were no ships to be had. The only thing to do was to build them.

Later the submarine menace appeared, and its depredations were such that in the first quarter of 1917 they sank 240,000 tons more shipping than Great Britain built that year. In 1917 submarines sank one-sixth of the entire merchant marine of Great Britain.

The situation became desperate.

It was perfectly plain that although the Royal Navy stood intact, if this destruction continued a few months longer and we could not build ships as fast as they could be sunk, Great Britain would be out of the war.

Lord Inchcape well said, "The British mercantile marine, which was built up without a penny of aid from the Government, has borne no small share in saving the country from defeat."

The war demonstrated absolutely that an adequate navy, sea power of a nation, must have something more than battleships, cruisers, destroyers, and the like, an aggregation of floating batteries. There must be colliers, tankers, supply ships, a merchant marine as well.

It was fortunate for the world that Great Britain owned so large a supply of merchant ships. She was, notwithstanding the terrific losses, able to carry 66 per cent of our troops as late as August, 1918. She also furnished 90 per cent of the patrol, guard, and convoys. Her merchant sailors rendered invaluable service.

It was made clear that a merchant marine is as much a part of an efficient navy as the battleships.

The United Kingdom lost during the war 8,000,000 gross tons by submarines and 1,000,000 gross tons by marine risk.

The figures are given by competent authority as follows:

	Dead-weight tons.
At the beginning of the war allied and neutral tonnage was, estimated.....	59,465,000
Total losses during the war.....	21,404,000
Total construction, both allied and neutral.....	14,247,000
Enemy tonnage acquired.....	3,795,000
Loss due to failure to build.....	14,713,000
Net deficit due to war on Jan. 1, 1919.....	18,062,000

The value of the world's shipping overseas in July, 1914, was about \$2,500,000,000.

We will spend about \$3,800,000,000 and own about one-fourth the shipping of the world.

	Dead-weight tons.
We completed in 1918.....	3,103,593
We created incomplete shipping in 1918.....	2,540,896
Total.....	5,644,489

This was 50 per cent more than Great Britain built and 25 per cent more than all the rest of the world and three times the amount launched in 1917 and more than the entire output of the United States for 1907 to 1916. To do this there were employed as many as—in the shipyards and plants—788,000 men. Quite regularly there were 400,000 shipyard workers engaged.

Congress has authorized the expenditure of \$3,671,000,000 for carrying forward the work of creating an American merchant marine and appropriated \$2,625,451,000. The Shipping Board asks for \$673,368,301 more.

There were built 8,800 houses and 1,100 dormitories for the workers, at a cost of \$75,000,000. For the transportation of the workers we spent \$20,000,000.

We have been expending about \$5,000,000 per day in carrying out the great shipbuilding program.

The Government now owns 555 steel cargo vessels, aggregating 3,385,000 dead-weight tons, and has under contract 1,336 more, of 9,225,000 tons.

Unless further cancellations take place we should have under our flag next year 16,732,000 dead-weight tons, of which about 14,000,000 will be fit for overseas trade.

There is no need so pressing at this time as ocean transportation.

The carrying capacity of the merchant marine to-day of the world is at least 5,000,000 tons less than it was in July, 1914.

There will be work for shipyards and an urgent demand for shipping until this loss is made up and the increased needs of the world shall be met.



Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Florida if he has any accurate figures showing the total destruction of the world's commerce by submarines during the war? I have understood that it was about 13,000,000 tons, and I wish to know if the Senator has looked carefully into that matter.

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator from Louisiana was probably absent from the Chamber a moment ago when I gave that tonnage. The total losses during the war aggregated 21,404,000 dead-weight tons.

Mr. RANDELL. How did that compare with the total ocean-going commerce?

Mr. FLETCHER. There were 59,465,000 tons of ocean-going shipping.

Mr. RANDELL. Then something over one-third of the total of the shipping of the world was destroyed by the submarine?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes. As I have it, there were 59,465,000 dead-weight tons of allied and neutral shipping for the world, and the losses were 21,404,000 tons.

Mr. RANDELL. I thank the Senator from Florida.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will ask the Senator from Florida what is a dead-weight ton?

Mr. FLETCHER. A dead-weight ton is the cargo capacity of the ship. The difference between the dead-weight ton and the gross ton is arrived at in this way: You multiply the gross ton by 150 to get the dead-weight ton, and you multiply the dead-weight ton by 66 $\frac{2}{3}$  to get the gross tonnage. There is quite a difference between the two, and there is often some confusion created by the description of ships by tonnage. It is therefore important to specify whether one means gross tons or dead-weight tons when giving statistics relative to shipping.

Dead-weight tonnage is the ordinary method of expressing the commercial value of a cargo vessel for purposes of charter or purchase, and it is intended to be a measure of the cargo-carrying capacity.

Net registered tonnage is the gross tonnage less the space occupied by engines and boilers, plus 75 per cent, plus the space occupied by the crew.

Gross tonnage is the ordinary record of the tonnage of merchant vessels, and is the internal cubic capacity of the vessel divided by 100—that is, a gross ton is 100 cubic feet measured inside the frames of the space devoted to the carriage of cargo or passengers, or is otherwise inclosed.

To compute dead-weight tons from gross tons, take 150 per cent of the gross tonnage—for example, a vessel of 10,000 gross tons equals 15,000 dead-weight tons. To compute gross tons from dead-weight tons, take 66 $\frac{2}{3}$  per cent of the dead-weight tonnage.

We are prepared to build ships, not only to meet the domestic requirements, but to supply the world demand. We have the shipyards, the trained workers, and the raw material in greater abundance than any other country or countries.

Ship plates and structural material has declined, according to Mr. James A. Farrell, who knows, \$12 per ton here, with a corresponding reduction in collateral forms of iron and steel products. Ship plates are selling in England at \$67 per ton, and shipbuilding shapes at \$66 per ton, whereas in the United States they can be had at \$53 and \$49, respectively.

Since the signing of the armistice contracts have been canceled or suspended, which means the same thing in the existing circumstances, for 754 ships, aggregating 3,797,825 dead-weight tons, which would have cost to complete \$797,564,276. The cost of cancellation is estimated at about \$202,853,456. The cancellations amount to more than 25 per cent of the full program.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. KING. The Senator has just stated, as I understood his figures, that the cancellations would be more than \$200,000,000. Does he mean that the loss to the Government will be more than \$200,000,000 because of the termination of contracts which have been entered into and in order to settle claims for damages growing out of those contracts?

Mr. FLETCHER. That is practically the situation. There will be left on hand, of course, a lot of salvage material and that sort of thing, which the Shipping Board will have to dispose of and credit on this outlay; but the Senator has stated it about as it is, with the possible exception, as I have said, that we will be able to get something back out of the material on hand which was ordered to carry out these contracts.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, have the board agreed upon a basis of settlement to pay so much as damages for the obligation of the contracts upon which nothing has been done?

Mr. FLETCHER. Wherever nothing has been done and no materials have been ordered, there is no damage allowed, but

wherever the material has been ordered, even though the construction has not actually been begun and the contract is canceled, then the question of damages arises.

I will say to the Senator that, according to the statement before the committee, the board fixed, rather arbitrarily but based on the best information they could obtain as to the actual cost of building to-day and values at this time, a maximum of \$50 a ton as a limit for cancellation; that is to say, if a ship ought to be built at \$50 per ton less now than the contract price, and if they cancel the contract and get out of it profitably on that basis, they will do so, provided the keel has not been laid and other complications have not set in which would make it pay to finish the ship. It is a plain business proposition, whether it would pay the Government to go on and finish the ship at the contract price or cancel the contract and pay the damages, not exceeding a maximum of \$50 per ton, as I remember, which perhaps is rather an arbitrary figure. If the ship can not be sold when completed within \$50 a ton of what it will cost under the contract, it is considered advisable, everything else being equal, to cancel the contract and pay damages within that amount.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I of course can not express any intelligent opinion with respect to the wisdom of those settlements. I have made some little investigation, and it seems to me that that loss is rather too heavy, yet, of course, the committee, having investigated the matter, would have fuller information than any of us not upon the committee have been permitted to obtain. But what I wanted to ask the Senator was whether or not the figures which have been given to the committee have been those that have been produced by employees or officials connected with the department, or has the committee obtained the services of some competent shipping expert to look into this question to advise it as to the character of the ships, what ought to be paid by way of damages for cancellation, and the subject generally? I make that inquiry for the reason that I find that many of these governmental agencies have furnished testimony which some of us think has been biased and needs some other testimony in order to present the full facts in the case.

This is a matter so important, it is a subject so transcendently important now, particularly the question of what should be done with the ships, the cost of the ships, and if they are sold, what price they ought to bring, that independent testimony, it occurs to me, could materially aid the committee in reaching a conclusion with respect to the matter.

Mr. FLETCHER. I will say to the Senator that the hearings before the committee have not been concluded. It has been our purpose to call in all the people who have accurate information on this subject, and who might help us in arriving at a proper conclusion about it. Of course up to this time we have had the officials, and then we have had some shipbuilding people and others who seemed to be posted regarding the matter. I will state also that the Emergency Fleet Corporation established a committee or board that made quite a thorough examination of conditions all over the country, and they have had the benefit of their advice on the subject.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. I think it is a fact that in February they did make a survey of all commitments for material and all obligations that had been incurred by the various shipyards, with a view of determining what percentage of the contract price the Shipping Board would be compelled to pay on cancellations. That survey, of course, would be of little value now, because the work has proceeded to so much greater an extent; but I do understand, and it was testified before the committee, that a new survey is now being made.

With reference to the basis of cancellation, if I understood the Senator from Florida, he said it was based upon the difference between the assumed cost of building ships now and the contract cost with a maximum of \$50 per ton. I do not understand that to be exactly the basis. It is what the Shipping Board assumes would be the maximum loss on sale of the completed ships as compared with canceling the contract now, which the board assumes would be a maximum of \$50 per ton upon the sale. In other words, if we can complete a contract and sell the ship at a loss of not more than \$50 per ton, and if it would cost more than that to cancel we do not cancel.

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator is correct about that, I think.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. KING. I was prompted to make the observation I did a moment ago for several reasons; one of them being that I have recently observed that representatives of the Shipping Board have stated that they were disposing of ships which had been constructed by the Government for \$210 per ton, and that this was more than the ships cost. I have made some little investi-

gation and considerable inquiry. A number of persons connected with ship construction have stated to me that the ships have cost very much more than that amount. Indeed, one gentleman who had given some attention to the subject stated that the ships constructed and being constructed in the latter part of 1917 and the early part of 1918 would cost at least \$400 per ton. I am not sure whether he stated that that was per dead-weight ton or per gross ton; but all of my information is that, taking into account the cost of the plants, the overhead expense, and those things that ought legitimately to be charged against the output of ships, the cost is very much more than \$210 per ton; and if they are being sold for \$210 per ton, in my opinion, based upon the information which I have received, the Government is sustaining a very great loss.

I was wondering if the Senator had given attention to that matter, and if, in his admirable address this morning, he will discuss that question.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I would say that this matter of arriving at the precise cost of ships is a very complicated and a very difficult matter. For instance, the cost in one yard will be entirely different from the cost in another yard, owing to certain conditions; and the cost of the first ships put out by a yard will be much greater than the cost of subsequent ships, because at the outset you had to build your yard, you had to get the material. You had to organize your force and train your men. In subsequent operations of the yard you get the benefit of all that, and you are prepared to build your ships at a much better figure than you were at the beginning. The best they can do is to rather average this item of expense for building ships, and arrive at a cost spread out over the whole program; and that is what I presume they have done when they estimate these ships to cost about \$206 per ton. In some instances they have cost more than that; in other instances they have not cost as much. In most instances the cost has been higher than was originally expected, because wages went up, material went up, and various difficulties were encountered; and, as I say, they had to build with a sole regard for speed and a disregard of all other economic questions.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. FLETCHER. Certainly.

Mr. DIAL. Do I understand that the Shipping Board has a legal right to sell these ships at its pleasure?

Mr. FLETCHER. I will get to that in a few minutes. The actual state of the law is that the President has the right and power to construct, operate, and dispose of ships built in pursuance of the appropriations made, and the President has the right to delegate that authority to any agency he may select. I assume that the Shipping Board is acting under the authority granted to it by the President in pursuance of the law.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I apologize to the Senator, but if he will permit one further observation, perhaps in the nature of a question, I shall be obliged.

Mr. FLETCHER. I will.

Mr. KING. A short time ago I made a rough calculation, based upon the best information I could obtain. I ascertained the appropriations which had been made to the Shipping Board for all purposes—that is to say, for employees, for the construction of shipyards, and for all of the objects which the board was created to carry out. Then I ascertained as best I could the number of tons that had been constructed, the number of tons that were upon the ways, and, as nearly as I could, the state of completion. Of course, the calculation which I could make, based upon those incomplete factors, of necessity would be inaccurate; but the very best figures that I could obtain from those calculations were that the ships that were completed—and, at the same ratio, those that were upon the ways, if they had been completed at the same cost—at the time of the armistice and about a month ago, when I made the calculation, would have cost the Government approximately \$300 or a little above per ton.

Now, I should be very glad to know—and it seems to me that it is susceptible of computation—whether or not we are selling ships at a very great loss. I do not think it is quite fair for those who are disposing of these ships to bring into the equation here factors that ought not to be taken into account. We ought to ascertain what the cost of ships has been in the past, and, if we are determined to sell, sell them at the highest price possible. I have been told that we could have gotten for our ships more than \$210 per ton. That information may be entirely inaccurate; but, if we are going to sell, we ought to know what the cost of the ships has been in the past, and we ought to sell for as much as the Government can get for its completed vessels.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have no doubt that the board is getting all that can be had for these ships that it is selling. I am impressed that \$210 per ton is a very excellent price for steel ships; but I will state that they arrive at the matter of cost in this manner:

First, however, let me point out to the Senator that out of these appropriations which he had before him we will say \$100,000,000 went into the shipyards, \$66,000,000 at Hog Island, and the balance of the \$100,000,000 at Newark Bay and at Bristol. The Government's money built those yards. Then about \$100,000,000 went into the housing and transportation. To arrive at the cost of the ships up to date, you want to distribute that cost through the whole program. You could not add that to your appropriation, and then figure that that is a part of the cost of ships built in these yards, for instance.

Now, here is the way that they arrive at the estimate of cost:

Built and contracted for by the Government there will be 2,434 vessels, aggregating 13,885,106 dead-weight tons, which will involve an outlay of \$2,861,755,570. This would indicate the cost of the ships to be \$206 a dead-weight ton; but, as explained by Chairman Hurley, if we deduct income and excess-profits taxes and the like, estimated to amount to \$347,127,650, it leaves \$2,514,527,920, or \$180 a dead-weight ton, as the actual cost to the Government. Now, whether or not you want to figure that you have a right to deduct the excess-profits taxes, and take that out of the cost, just depends on your way of calculating; but, if you do that, as I say, the cost figures \$180 a dead-weight ton.

The Shipping Board has sold some freighters, 7,500 tons, at \$210 a dead-weight ton.

The board believes this tonnage will be 2,000,000 tons more than is sufficient to move 50 per cent of our exports.

We will have about 800,000 tons of wooden ships.

The Fleet Corporation delivered in May, 1919, 768,000 tons of ships, and launched 700,000 tons.

The ships on the program will cost, completed, it is thought, from \$200 to \$202 per ton.

If a proposed cancellation would cost exceeding \$50 per ton, it would not be ordered.

Fifty dollars per ton is the estimated maximum cost of cancellation.

It is supposed that no contracts can be had in Great Britain for less than \$140 to \$160 per ton, and then only on long-time and a cost-plus or "time-and-time" basis.

Contracts equally favorable can be placed in the United States.

I have endeavored to condense the material facts showing our shipping situation.

We have had only a glimpse of the needs of an adequate merchant marine under the American flag. There is no call for any argument on that point.

We have noted what our experience has been thus far, both in construction and operation.

#### PROPER POLICY.

We have sketched what has been accomplished, the results and what lies in expectation.

The program of construction of 1918 has been reduced materially, and no new contracts are contemplated.

The Shipping Board and the Director of Operations recommend that the Government discontinue the construction of ships as soon as existing contracts are performed, that the Government sell its ships, and that the Government retire from the operating business.

The very important question is therefore, What shall be the future policy of the Government in respect to these matters?

They are of grave, far-reaching concern to the country.

Congress must determine now whether—

(1) The Government shall cease the building of ships when those under contract are completed. If so, what is to become of the Hog Island plant, which has cost about \$66,000,000, as it stands; the yard at Bristol, Pa., and rights under the option respecting the submarine-boat yard at Newark, and interests in other shipyards?

(2) Shall the Government sell off all its ships, built and acquired; and if so, upon what terms and conditions?

(3) Shall the Government cease the operation of its ships entirely and abandon all organization and plans heretofore undertaken in that connection?

What is to be our policy—temporary or permanent?

President Wilson said May 24, 1914, in an address to the Pan-American Congress:

One of our chief needs is to have a merchant marine, because if we have to deliver our goods in other people's delivery wagons, their goods are delivered first and our goods are delivered only incidentally, if at all. \* \* \* Since private capital has not established an American merchant marine, it is now the duty of the Government to undertake it.

The President on another occasion, illustrating how clearly and deeply he sees into the future, foretold precisely what was likely to happen to us in these words:

If other nations go to war or seek to hamper each other's commerce, our merchants will be at their mercy, for we have no ships of our own and can not control our own commerce.



He warned the country, as he, with that rare foresight and vision, which has characterized his administration, urged that the Government should build and own merchant ships, as he continued to say:

Such a situation is not to be endured. It is of capital importance that the United States should be its own carrier on the seas and enjoy the economic independence which only an adequate merchant marine would give it.

The great merchant fleet we once used to make us rich, that great body of sturdy sailors who used to carry our flag into every sea, and who were the pride and often the bulwark of the Nation, we have almost driven out of existence in inexcusable neglect and indifference and by a hopelessly blind and provincial policy. It is high time we repaired our mistake and resumed our commercial independence on the seas.

Serious and diligent effort was made to have Congress act in accordance with the advice and views of the President, but determined opposition defeated the legislation then proposed and urged.

Finally, world conditions developed and, as the President predicted, we realized the mistake of depending on foreign ships to carry our goods and the absolute necessity of building our own ships without delay.

The shipping act, approved September 7, 1916, resulted. It was, as is most legislation, something of a compromise. It does, however, set forth a policy.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. I do.

Mr. KING. I hesitate to venture any opinion that runs contrary to the trend of the Senator's argument at present being developed, and yet it seems to me that the facts compel us to state that the merchant marine, to which such eloquent tribute has just been paid, was developed not by the Government, not by a system of bounties, but by the genius of the American people and by the enactment of liberal laws that contributed to the development of the merchant marine. It seems to me that if the same causes which gave us a great merchant marine that carried into every sea of the world the products of mine and field and farm could operate to-day they would produce the same result. I do not think it necessarily follows because we have not a merchant marine that it is attributable to the failure of the Government to build a merchant marine, and I do not think it necessarily follows that we will not have a merchant marine unless the Government itself builds the merchant marine.

Mr. FLETCHER. Of course, I am only giving the history of things. We can arrive at our own conclusions about it based upon whatever data there is before us. I am only saying that for 50 years private enterprise failed to build up an American merchant marine and that we had 4,000,000 tons less of merchant shipping on the high seas in 1914 than we had in 1861.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will yield further, belonging to the same political faith as the distinguished Senator from Florida, I think it would not be improper to challenge his attention to the fact that, at least, his party and my party have ascribed the absence of a merchant marine to certain unwise legislation which was enacted by the Republican Party.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I should like to state that in the Journal of Commerce of New York for the 24th of the present month there is a statement to the effect that during April of this year 31 per cent of the ocean-borne export trade of the United States as measured by volume was carried under the American flag as compared with 20 per cent in April, 1918. Of this trade British ships carried in April, 1918, 50 per cent, while in April, 1919, the present year, they carried only 31.6 per cent. I can not vouch for the accuracy of this statement, but if it be true it certainly shows that under the policy recently adopted and put into effect by this administration we are carrying an enormously greater percentage of our commerce now than we were one year ago, backing up the general argument of the Senator that we are going forward by leaps and bounds in our shipbuilding program, which amounted to nothing when the war began in 1914.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think unquestionably we are taking our place on the sea. The problem now is, What shall we do to maintain that position and increase it? I agree with the Senator that there is no need to argue that the Government ought to give a bounty to shipping, or anything of that sort.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if there is an unrestricted authority to dispose of vessels just as the board wishes to do so?

Mr. FLETCHER. I think there is, Mr. President. I think the authority is vested in the President, and he has power to delegate it to the Shipping Board.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It is just one of those wide powers we gave during the war to the President as to what he can do.

Mr. FLETCHER. I will refer to that a little later on.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. May I ask one question more? Does not the Senator think that sales on long time, an amortization plan, part payments, a little more than interest on the money, would dispose of these vessels faster than selling them for cash?

Mr. FLETCHER. I think they are selling them on time. They are only asking 25 per cent cash down, 12½ per cent in one year, and the remainder distributed over four years.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Could they not just as well run for 10 years? Ought it not to be studied and planned to dispose of them at figures that facilitate the broadest number possible of purchases?

Mr. FLETCHER. That is true. I hope they are doing that. I, of course, can not tell exactly what they are doing, because this is new and we have no reports as to details. The only information I have on that subject is some statements made before the Committee on Commerce several days ago and these newspaper reports.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator intend to discuss later on in his remarks the question as to whether or not there is a reservation of title? My understanding is that ships are being sold to-day without any agreement that the ownership shall be retained by Americans and that they shall be operated under the American flag. It would seem to me that there ought to be such a reservation. It would be highly improper to use these vast funds of the Government to construct ships merely to dispose of them to aliens to be operated under the flag of some other country.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think, undoubtedly, those that have been sold thus far are required to continue under American register. There is some suggestion that I saw in the newspapers of sales being made to foreign Governments. Of course, if there are any sales of that sort contemplated they will pass entirely under a foreign flag.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Have we not a bill pending before us now by which, with the proper amendments, we could restrict the power to sell entirely ships that will remain under the American flag?

Mr. FLETCHER. There is a bill introduced by the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], which provides for a future policy, but I think the present law protects fully as regards the transfer of flags. It is an old statute, and the Shipping Board has the absolute power to prevent transfer to a foreign flag.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Shipping Board has that power, but have we by legislation made it impossible for them to transfer to a foreign flag?

Mr. FLETCHER. I think not. I think it is a matter of discretion with the board to permit that to be done.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If they did transfer to a foreign flag, and we, by legislation, have left that authority with them, would we not be equally responsible with them for the improper course they would pursue?

Mr. FLETCHER. That is one bearing that these remarks are intended to cover on this general question.

As I stated, the shipping act approved September 7, 1916, was, as is most legislation, a compromise. It does, however, set forth a policy. That policy was that the Government should proceed to build and acquire merchant ships to be employed in the overseas trade of the country.

That the Government should own those ships until "the expiration of five years from the conclusion of the present European war declared by the proclamation of the President."

That the Government could sell, lease, or charter such vessels, and must do so, provided if the board shall be unable after a bona fide effort to contract with any person, a citizen of the United States, for the purchase, lease, or charter of such vessel under such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the board, then it could "engage in the operation of any" such vessels.

In other words, the policy was to charter the vessels to private parties if it could be done on a proper basis; otherwise the President would declare conditions existed justifying the operation of the vessel.

The emergency shipping act approved November 4, 1918, provides that "all ships constructed, purchased, or requisitioned under authority herein, or heretofore or hereafter acquired by the United States, shall be managed, operated, and disposed of as the President may direct."

This act carried authorizations "for purchasing, requisitioning, or otherwise acquiring plants, material, charters, or ships now constructed," and so forth, of \$250,000,000. For the "cost of construction of ships," and so forth, \$500,000,000. For "the operation of the ships," and so forth, \$3,000,000.

The act further provides that "all authority granted to the President herein, or by him delegated, shall cease six months after a final treaty of peace is proclaimed between this Government and the German Empire."

Until that time the President has absolute authority and power to manage, operate, and dispose of the ships constructed, purchased, requisitioned, or otherwise acquired by the Government.

I have been disposed to leave the authority and power there. At any time within the limitation set by that act the President can, if he has not otherwise disposed of them, transfer the ships to the United States Shipping Board. In that case they come under the operation of the shipping act of 1916 and are to be, by that act, handled as it provides.

If it be the will of Congress to extend or modify the powers of the President under the act of November 4, 1918, it is obvious that early action should be taken. If Congress holds to the policy expressed in the shipping act of 1916 there is no real need of further legislation. The ships, contracts, and all property would come to the Shipping Board six months after peace or before, I take it, to be administered, managed, and handled as that act provides for at least five years more.

On the first question, as to policy regarding construction, I do not favor the abandonment of all construction by the Government and scrapping the yards, in which such large sums of money have been invested. I think the Government might gradually work out of construction, but in the meantime get the benefit of the plants and facilities already created, and build such ships for such purposes as the country needs.

#### GOVERNMENT YARDS.

For instance, we have the option to acquire fee simple title to the Hog Island property, on which we have expended about \$86,000,000, for \$1,740,747.15, and we can exercise that option at any time. It embraces 927.14 acres of land, with about a mile frontage on Delaware River, including riparian rights, piers, 50 shipways, warehouses, railways, water, sewer, and lighting systems, buildings, and improvements of every nature. As a great ocean terminal the property is worth practically what it has cost, but at auction it would not bring one-tenth its real value. It is too large for any private concern to operate as a shipyard. It might be divided into several yards. Just to close it down and attempt to sell it would call for enormous sacrifice. We could lease a portion of it and operate the other, continuing to build steel ships as demands for our foreign trade requires.

The yard at Bristol, on which we have spent \$14,554,934.19, we might not continue. We had the option under the contract (vol 1, p. 763 of hearings) to purchase the real estate, including buildings, at \$1,860,500 plus taxes and assessments.

The yard at Newark Bay, on which we have spent \$17,328,980.06 and on which we have a lease with an option to buy, should yield us something.

There are at Newark Bay 112.79 acres (including streets, 71.41 acres) and we pay \$32,560 per month for 21 months. The Fleet Corporation built the plant on leased ground and has an option to purchase the land at \$12,000 per acre, which lease expires December 15, 1922.

The contracts were to build at these agency yards, with results thus far, as follows:

Submarine Boat, Newark, one hundred and fifty 5,000-ton ships; 54 hulls launched and 27 delivered. Merchants' Co., Bristol, sixty 9,000-ton ships; 11 hulls launched and 8 delivered; 20 hulls canceled. American International, Hog Island, fifty 7,500-ton ships; added sixty 7,500-ton ships, seventy 8,000-ton ships, 35 of the latter being canceled and 23 suspended; 22 ships delivered and 34 hulls launched.

Whatever we do as to the agency yards at Bristol and Newark, we should unquestionably exercise our option and acquire title to the yard at Hog Island.

My judgment is we ought to continue to build ships there.

An item in the newspapers of June 17 recites that 19 steel cargo ships, aggregating 128,472 dead-weight tons, have been sold by the Shipping Board at prices ranging from \$210 to \$225 a ton to New York ship operators. These vessels averaged 6,760 tons each. The question is, Why sell them? They can earn excellent profits on an investment of \$300 a ton at this time.

Some of the money which has gone into these vessels under war conditions, when it was necessary to sacrifice economy for speed, and therefore laid the Fleet Corporation open to the charge of waste, can never be gotten back, and the excess cost can be wiped out by judicious operation for Government account. I think that should be done.

I quite agree that as the vessels were built with war uses in view, there may be types which should now be sold if it can

be done without loss, in order to balance and better the fleet, but this idea of selling ships because they can be sold at or a little above cost, when they can pay for themselves in a few months, is a mistake. There is a real shortage of ships, and will be for some months, perhaps years, to come. Freight rates will continue abnormally high. The Government ships can serve our commerce on advantageous terms to shippers and still earn enormous profits, and I believe that should be done rather than sell the ships and have those profits go to the purchasers.

Chairman Hurley, who has devoted his best ability, his untiring energy, and his patriotic purposes, with rare patience and zeal, to the gigantic task which confronted the Shipping Board and the Emergency Fleet Corporation, since he became chairman of the one and president of the other, is quoted in the press as saying, about June 18:

The United States is the only country in the world to-day where ships can be sold for spot delivery. \* \* \* Since we began selling ships a short time ago we have disposed of 322,045 dead-weight tons. The total amount of these sales now aggregate \$51,854,620.

Treating these ships as a much-desired asset of the American people, whose money built them, why sell them at a time when such property is so scarce and they can be had nowhere else and their earning capacity must be at the maximum?

Because we can get approaching their cost is not sufficient reason for disposing of them absolutely, particularly if they can serve our commerce and earn a fair profit on more than their cost, as would seem to be the case.

They are now earning, Mr. Hurley admits, excellent profit on a cost of \$300 a ton.

We are in the position of having property which is in keen demand all over the world, and which can be had from no other owners, and which we greatly need. If we part with that property it is gone forever, and, we are told, is not to be replaced.

Not only is it proposed to sell the property, valuable as it is, needed as it is, desirable as it is, but the great industry established for its creation and important to the Nation, must also be abandoned, so far as the Government is concerned.

Sound business, good judgment, and public interest call for the making of that industry secure and permanent. At great expense and infinite labor we have gone through the stages required for its foundation, its development, and its completed structure. Why make junk of our equipment, facilities, machinery, and fixtures, by the employment of which we have been able to lead the world in construction and output?

Why do that now, when the world needs that output and when that need is supplied it will have to be continually kept supplied with new output to take the place of losses and depreciation which are inevitable?

Mr. RANSEDELL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. RANSEDELL. I hope I do not break the line of the Senator's thought, but I would like very much to have him state whether he has investigated to see how rapidly the world is replacing the 21,000,000 tons of shipping which were destroyed, more than one-third of all the commercial ships of the world. Is that being very rapidly rebuilt and replaced?

Mr. FLETCHER. It was not my purpose to deal with that particularly, but I will answer the Senator in this way: It is my information that Great Britain can probably build 2,000,000 tons a year, France probably 1,000,000 tons, Japan probably half a million tons, and, of course, at that rate it would take a good many years to replace that shipping.

Mr. RANSEDELL. Would not that back up the Senator's argument that we ought to maintain these yards and continue to operate them for a while, at least until we have restored the normal to the shipping of the world?

Mr. FLETCHER. That is my view of it.

Mr. RANSEDELL. I think that is right in line with the Senator's argument. If he will permit me, I have a very interesting statement here—I do not know whether it is correct—from an English publication called *Fairplay*, dated June 12, which I would like to read. It is very brief:

The German Government has decided to help German shipowners to build up their fleets, and the negotiations which have taken place between the Government, the shipowners, and the shipbuilders with regard to the necessary contracts have now been concluded. It has been decided that the shipbuilders are to construct the necessary steamers on time and lime, plus a percentage for profit. With regard to the payment for these vessels, the cost is to be divided between the Government and the shipowners on the following basis: The cost of ships is to be taken per ton gross on the 1st of August, 1914, and the 1st of October, 1918, and the difference is to be paid equally by the Government and the shipowners, and any increase since October is to be paid entirely by the Government. As costs have increased enormously since October this will mean a heavy Government subsidy. For instance, it is stated that a steamer which cost 2,000,000 marks in 1914 cost 5,600,000 marks in October, 1918, and will cost 14,000,000 marks at the present time, with the result that, while the shipowner



will pay 4,800,000 marks for his ship, the Government will be liable for 9,200,000 marks (equal to £460,000 at pre-war rates), a liability which she will hardly be able to meet if the Allies impose their full terms on Germany. But, notwithstanding this generous subsidy, German shipowners are not satisfied, for, while they have given many orders to shipbuilders, it is reported that it is impossible to obtain deliveries of the necessary steel, with the result that the shortage of material will make shipbuilding impossible.

I understand that "lime" means cost.

Mr. FLETCHER. Cost plus.

Mr. RANDELL. I read that simply for the purpose of backing up the very interesting argument being made by the Senator to show that at least Germany, if this account is correct, is certainly doing everything possible to restore its fleet, and it behooves us to bear in mind very carefully what is going on in the shipbuilding industry of the world when we talk about disposing of our ships and our shipyards.

Mr. FLETCHER. I am obliged to the Senator for this contribution to the discussion. I am quite clear, and I think that article shows it, that we can build in the United States as cheaply as building can be done anywhere. The time has passed, Mr. President, when Great Britain or any other country can build steel ships of a desirable kind at less cost than they can be built in the United States. We have the labor, we have the material, we have the facilities, we have the means and resources now for building as quickly and as efficiently and as cheaply as ships can be built anywhere.

It is very gratifying to note that the stockholders of the International Mercantile Marine, practically all American, decided not to sell its fleet to foreign interests, even at a tempting offer.

This action indicates that they realize the time has come when American citizens should, and are determined to, hold what shipping they have, and add to it as they may.

The United States is not ambitious to become the greatest military power. We are not anxious to be the greatest naval power.

We do expect to rank as the greatest commercial Nation in the world, and this, we believe, surpasses the other two. That nation which can produce a surplus of the prime necessities of life which other nations must have or go hungry and unclothed is in position of supreme strength. No nation can equal us in that respect if we supplement that capacity for production by adequate facilities for distribution; that is to say, if we own and manage the necessary carriers for the transportation of those products. We are just now, for the first time in over 50 years, able to claim we can do that. To make that certain and insure its permanency should be our determination. The means of doing it should receive our earnest solicitation and care. Our policy should be to preserve those means. If they go into private hands just as we have obtained them, what will become of them we can not say. Until it is made plain that it will profit private owners to use those means under our flag and in accordance with our laws and in our interest the Government should hold on to them.

Later, under proper covenants and assurances, the Government may relinquish its grasp on the industry and business, leaving private enterprise loyal and stimulated to maintain and perpetuate them.

#### NEW ROUTES.

There are markets undisclosed, regions untouched by trade, fields unexplored, possibilities of development not comprehended which we are in position to bring into their own.

Those Government ships afford us the means of accomplishing great results in that direction.

The Government need not interfere with existing lanes or with the business of the companies now operating.

The Government can help rather than harm them, and at the same time extend our trade and promote the commercial interests of our people.

Two things, the experts agree, will overcome all advantages any competitor may have and place us where we can compete with all countries on the sea.

First. Regular schedules and certain sailings over defined routes.

Second. Railroad cooperation in issuing through bills of lading from origin to destination, making a proper division of the freight with the connecting water line.

Third. Mail contracts based on service rendered.

What individual or what company can do these things?

A few individuals may have the vision to discern accurately the possibilities of commercial advantages and extension in new directions, but capital will be needed to carry into effect their ideas, and capital is proverbially timid. It will not be found to back visions. It requires something more than vision and prospects. It will know something about profits. It may back men of character and experience who have the vision to a limited

extent, and very soon it will want to know about the practical results, and if the dividends are not coming in or satisfactory reasons given, based on realities, it will discontinue support.

Only the Government is in position to open up new routes of trade and develop markets now empty and waiting and ready.

President Wilson understood this when he addressed Congress December 8, 1914, and so admirably and forcefully said:

It may seem a reversal of the natural order of things, but it is true that the routes of trade must be actually opened—by many ships and regular sailings and moderate charges—before streams of merchandise will flow freely and profitably through them.

Hence the pending shipping bill, discussed at the last session, but as yet passed by neither House. In my judgment such legislation is imperatively needed and can not wisely be postponed. The Government must open these gates of trade, and open them wide; open them before it is altogether profitable to open them, or altogether reasonable to ask private capital to open them at a venture. It is not a question of the Government monopolizing the field. It should take action to make it certain that transportation at reasonable rates will be promptly provided, even where the carriage is not at first profitable; and then when the carriage has become sufficiently profitable to attract and engage private capital, and engage it in abundance, the Government ought to withdraw. I very earnestly hope that the Congress will be of this opinion, and that both Houses will adopt this exceedingly important bill.

The legislation to which he referred was not enacted until and only as it came forth in the form of the present shipping act of September 7, 1916.

In that same address to Congress the President said what we should bear in mind to-day as a warning against a course which may place the country in the position it then occupied with reference to shipping, to wit:

How are we to build up a great trade if we have not the certain and constant means of transportation upon which all profitable and useful commerce depends? And how are we to get the ships if we wait for the trade to develop without them? To correct the many mistakes by which we have discouraged and all but destroyed the merchant marine of the country, to retrace the steps by which we have, it seems, almost deliberately withdrawn our flag from the seas, except where, here and there, a ship of war is bidden carry it or some wandering yacht displays it, would take a long time and involve many detailed items of legislation, and the trade which we ought immediately to handle would disappear or find other channels while we debated the items.

Referring in that same message to "our own neighbors, the States, great and small of Central and South Americas," and he might have added the rich islands between, he said:

Their lines of trade have hitherto run chiefly athwart the seas, not to our ports but to the ports of Great Britain and of the older Continent of Europe. I do not stop to inquire why or to make any comment on probable causes. What interests us just now is not the explanation but the fact, and our duty and opportunity in the presence of it. Here are markets which we must supply, and we must find the means of action. The United States, this great people for whom we speak and act, should be ready, as never before, to serve itself, and to serve mankind; ready with its resources, its energies, its forces of production, and its means of distribution.

It is a very practical matter, a matter of ways and means. We have the resources, but are we fully ready to use them? And if we can make ready what we have, have we the means at hand to distribute it? We are not fully ready; neither have we the means of distribution. We are willing, but we are not fully able. We have the wish to serve, and to serve greatly, generously, but we are not prepared as we should be.

Since then we have heeded his advice and we have begun and partially completed the means of distribution to which he referred.

We are now able to serve our neighbors and the world as never before. We have ceased to stunt and hinder the development of our merchant marine, and adopted a definite policy by which we are to own merchant vessels second only in quantity to Great Britain and unsurpassed in efficiency. These will carry our flag to every port and harbor that a ship can reach over the seven seas, and they will furthermore cause the development of harbors worthy of improvement, delayed only by lack of ships to use them.

Now, just as we approach that situation we are seriously threatened with a policy which will place us where we were in 1914, so clearly pictured and deplored by the President then. It is that we are to cancel contracts for ships right and left. We are to sell our ships. We are to rely on the patriotism and vision and enterprise of private individuals to keep our flag on the ocean and in the harbors throughout the world, and use the ships the Government has built and sold to them, and such as they may build, to serve the country, the producers and manufacturers, and merchants, from being dependent on our competitors in foreign markets for the delivery of our goods.

This policy brought us to our former helpless state, the gravity of which we never fully realized until 1914. Although Congress had endeavored, by various acts, to stimulate and develop the shipbuilding industry in the United States and promote the interests of American shipping, private enterprise refused to respond. The Government had to step in and do something. When the time came to insure ships and cargoes, the Government had to establish a bureau to carry the risk. We had gone so far behind and there was so much needed to be done, and done at once, individuals could not do it.

We have a considerable portion of the shipping the country needs. We are building sufficient to complete the requirements for the present, provided the contracts are not canceled in such number as to still leave us short of an adequate fleet.

Just as we begin to take our place as an independent, self-respecting Nation on the seas, just as we emerge from the pitiable and distressing position we had got in, and are prepared to serve our own commerce and reach out for the trade of the world, we begin to abandon the tremendous task we undertook, get weary on the forward march to the objective, incline to lay down the burden we have thus far safely carried, halt in the purpose wisely adopted, and, to my mind, weakly surrender when in sight of a glorious achievement.

As if a thing to boast of, we are told the ships are being sold, some of the wooden ships at about half their cost, others approaching cost, and some steel ships, it is proudly claimed, have brought as much as \$225 a dead-weight ton. They are actually earning a splendid profit on a price of \$300 per ton. We do not appear to think it worth while to have this property of the people, built by proceeds of Liberty bonds, earn back, for the people, some of the money which went into it, but prefer to dispose of it and have the purchasers get the benefit of the prevailing high rates on ocean traffic.

Not only so, but the terms of sale require only 25 per cent down, 12½ per cent in six months, with four years in which to pay the remainder.

It will be sorry management that will prevent these ships from paying for themselves within that period.

It appears a foreign government is negotiating for the purchase of 150 of these ships. I do not wonder. Nothing but a lack of money would interfere with the ships being taken up speedily and greedily.

The question is: Why does the Government cancel contracts, cease building ships and sell off the ships it has, or any of them, unless it be such as it can not use?

To be sure, it requires a considerable organization, composed of experienced, expert men, to operate the ships. It means a big business. But this is a considerable country, a big Government. These ships can be operated without interfering with established lines or with individuals who are in the business for profit, and such operation could be conducted to very great advantage to our people and benefit to the commerce of the world.

Individuals will not, naturally, risk their capital in establishing new business; buy ships to sail new lanes on a venture, however reasonable; or enter upon routes where time and further facilities will be necessary to make it profitable. Present rates are prohibitive in some cases and foreign business is to some extent handicapped and crippled by excessive freight charges. Our aim should be to reduce those charges, and the ownership and operation of ships would enable us to accomplish that. It would give us the means of unburdening commerce.

Instead of organizing a force and opening up offices "with credit, sales, legal, and engineering departments included in the offices," for the purpose of disposing of the ships, why not contribute an organization of proper character, and probably not more costly, for the purpose of operating the ships?

It may be of interest to note that while there have been some losses our experience in operating has certainly afforded no ground for discouragement. For instance, one of our Hog Island 7,500-ton steamers made a net profit of \$461,151.29 one voyage on the Atlantic. Another ship, operated by the board, made a net profit of \$801,000 one voyage of 110 days on the Pacific.

It will be borne in mind, too, that our rates are lower than the British, Italian, or French. Coal costing \$5 a ton at Norfolk brings \$25 a ton in Spain and \$28 a ton in Buenos Aires. We can load in eight hours at Norfolk a ship it would require six days to load at Barry Docks, Bristol Channel, and ten days at Cardiff. Sales will result in the ships going to augment lines already established and in the concentration of our shipping in a few hands.

Persons with only limited capital wishing to start an independent venture and to do some pioneering will not get any of the ships.

As soon as a favorable opportunity to sell or transfer a ship occurs, it will lose American registry.

Yards in the United States, when it is more profitable to build for foreign account, will do so, to the diminution rather than the continued increase of American ships.

It may be "convenient" but it is not "practical" to sell now. "Current-world market" means our market now.

It would seem entirely feasible to form responsible operating companies to become the operating agents for the Government.

Such companies need be furnished only enough money to insure the repair and upkeep of the ship. They could be assured of a small operating compensation, but their principal return would depend entirely on whether or not they made profits. If this is not feasible, I would rather charter the ships to private operating companies wherever they could demonstrate financial responsibility, business integrity and sagacity, and show a reasonable enterprise at any rate fixed by open competition that would return a moderate amount to the Government, and in judging of that I would not take into consideration any rate of depreciation greater than 5 per cent a year.

Those ships which can not be chartered to individuals who will engage to make any specific return to the Government and risk the ships for their own account could be employed by the Shipping Board in establishing new routes, just as mail routes are established. At first they will not pay, but they will develop trade, provide means of communication, uncover markets, and eventually become self-sustaining and then profitable.

Whether the Government should continue to build ships after the present program is completed it is somewhat early to determine now, and a decision on that point might well wait until we have the light and benefit of at least a year's experience. Some high-class mail and passenger ships, however, ought to be designed and ordered now by the Government, and the yards should be permitted, as now agreed, to build for foreigners.

Principles should be established for fixing rates, and the rate-making body should do its work in such a manner that private owners will build new ships and compete with the Government.

The liner field can be left to private owners or private operators, the latter having their ships at charter rates, fixed by competition with the owning companies as well as others.

These are not the views of those who wish to buy ships cheap from the Government, but I can not agree with them, and I fear they are not in position to express an unbiased judgment in the matter.

We are now in position to have a creditable, serviceable American merchant marine and to insure it for the future. If we act hastily and unwisely those in Congress to-day will not live to see another such opportunity. We have it in our power now, the chance is in our arm's length, and all we have to do is to close our grip around it to make the "starred banner the talisman of a world commerce." There has been a propaganda against the wooden ship, although it has been doing business for 2,000 years. I ask to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a clipping from page 20 of the Journal of Commerce and Commercial Bulletin, of June 19, headed, "Freights and charters"; also some resolutions typical of others received.

On November 12, 1915, before the Academy of Political Science, in New York, I had this to say, among other things, which I believe is worth repeating here:

Thought, however mature, conviction, however deep, get us nowhere until they begin to operate in will and act. Merely recounting with reiteration the deplorable situation, and nothing more, evidences a species of cynicism, an unhealthy state of mind—lays no keels.

There never was a time when a change in shipping conditions would be less disturbing and more advantageous than right now. Now is the best possible time to inaugurate such changes. Nothing will be gained by delay. We have all the information upon which to act. Satisfaction with present conditions means a sacrifice of golden opportunities and an inexcusable lack of proper conception of our responsibilities.

Monetary and trade supremacy had its inception on the banks of the Nile. It moved westward to the shores of the Mediterranean and thence farther westward out into the open sea of commercial activity. It passed from Portugal to Spain, then to Holland, then to France, and then to England. Venice, Lisbon, Amsterdam, Antwerp succeeded each other as centers; then London, the frontier town of the Middle Ages, at last supplanted them all.

The earlier struggles were directed to the attainment of some particular national supremacy, and that was to be founded on monopoly. That meant trouble. But the distinctive feature of commerce to-day is its international character. It is not a question of monopoly or particular supremacy; it is a question in large measure of leadership, and in this the factors are natural advantages, better methods, better facilities of exchange, efficient and economical service, a sound currency and financial influence, and the freest markets. I have seen it asserted that in all the world's history nothing has had lasting importance like trade. Pitt declared, "British rule is British trade." Chamberlain expressed the same thought in the statement, "The empire is commerce."

The marvelous resources of the United States, her financial strength and facilities, the awakening of the East and the promising outlook in Latin America, the Isthmian Canal, the opportunities for forming new commercial ties, the relations founded on a better understanding, and mutual good will toward all the world mean, if we but discharge our responsibilities, the establishment of commanding centers of trade in the United States and drawing westward again commercial leadership. The great English poet and dramatist gives us this picture:

Antonio is sad. Salarino says to him—

"Your mind is tossing on the ocean,  
There, where your argosies with portly sail,  
Like signiors and rich burghers on the flood,  
Or, as it were, the pageants of the sea,  
Do overpeer the petty traffickers,  
That curtsy to them, do them reverence,  
As they fly by them with their woven wings."



To which Antonio replies—

"Believe me, no; I thank my fortune for it,  
My ventures are not in one bottom trusted,  
Nor to one place; nor is my whole estate  
Upon the fortune of this present year;  
Therefore, my merchandise makes me not sad."

I ask leave to have printed a resolution from the Mississippi Valley Association and also a communication from Tampa, Fla., Board of Trade, which are typical of resolutions and communications I have received on this subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. New in the chair). In the absence of objection, it will be so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

CHICAGO, April 26, 1919.

HON. EDWARD N. HURLEY,  
Chairman United States Shipping Board, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HURLEY: The following resolutions relative to United States Shipping Board policies were unanimously adopted by more than 500 delegates representing some 22 States, comprising the Mississippi Valley, in convention assembled in Chicago, Wednesday, April 23:

"Resolved, That the present time is inopportune for the general sale of the ships constructed by the Emergency Fleet Corporation. They should continue under Government ownership until an American merchant marine has been permanently assured, necessary trade routes firmly established, and a personnel of officers and men built up.

"These ships should be assigned on a commission or bare ship or time charter basis to reliable financially responsible American firms not under foreign influence and whose Americanism is established.

"Furthermore, that the Shipping Board ships should be utilized to build up American foreign trade and allocated on a fair basis to all American ports.

"The Mississippi Valley demands recognition of its Gulf ports and the assignment of ships of standard efficiency, sufficient to move the foreign commerce of the valley both for export and import through these ports."

These resolutions express the thought of business leaders throughout the valley.

There has been, as you know, some fear in the valley that an early forced sale of Shipping Board ships might leave some ports and some sections less adequately provided for than others, and I was glad indeed to learn your point of view as expressed at our conference last night.

The members of the Mississippi Valley Association desire to help bring about a satisfactory solution of the problem involved, and to that end may I request you to advise me wherein your ideas and the ideas expressed in the above resolutions differ, if they differ at all?

With kindest personal regards,

Very truly,

WALTER PARKER,  
General Secretary Mississippi Valley Association.

THE TAMPA BOARD OF TRADE,  
Tampa, Fla., May 31, 1919.

HON. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: At a meeting of the water commerce bureau of this board of trade Mr. Philip Shore, chairman, held May 30, 1919, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted and the secretary directed to transmit the same to you:

"Resolved, That the perpetuation of the American merchant marine is to be secured for the present by Government ownership and private operation of the vessels of the Emergency Fleet Corporation as opposed to immediate sale or charter;

"That provision should be made for transfer of ownership of the said vessels to American private interests only after a period of from three to five years of their successful operation in established trade routes;

"That a copy of these resolutions be sent to the honorable the Senator DUNCAN U. FLETCHER, respectfully urging action along such lines."

Respectfully,

C. S. HOSKINS,  
Traffic Manager-Secretary of the Bureau.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I will say that at the appropriate time I shall ask to have the resolutions which I have mentioned referred to the Committee on Commerce.

I also ask to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a clipping from the New York Journal of Commerce of June 19, 1919, showing the service—the actual performance—of some of the wooden ships.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, it will be so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Since the armistice vessel owners have been in a position to make their own rates, and naturally the scarcity of tonnage has made them independent. For the past two months, however, conditions have been growing more favorable to exporters, who have lost no time in sending forward consignments that have been held in storage for many weeks. That there is likely to be further decline in rates from this port to most foreign countries is the belief of shippers.

#### SHIPPING BOARD VESSELS.

Many of the wooden steamers under Shipping Board control are being placed with operators for trades in which it has been argued these craft were not adapted because of their alleged unseaworthiness. Those that have been given a trial appear to have made good, and the outlook is encouraging for the employment of many more. The Ferris type wooden steamer *Cumberland*, the first boat built at the Cumberland Shipbuilding Co.'s yard in South Portland, Me., for the United States Shipping Board fleet, arrived at Liverpool June 14 from Boston, the run across having been made in 14 days, a passage particularly gratifying to her builders in view of the propaganda that has been carried on against the wooden steamers of the fleet. The ship went over in command of Capt. Charles Willard. Considerable interest has been attached to this trip, as it has been stated that foreign parties who had been negotiating for the purchase of some of the wooden crafts were awaiting the result before making up their minds.

The steamer *Wanzu*, the first of the fleet dispatched from the Northwest under the management of the Columbia Pacific Shipping Co., has been chartered by the Triangle Steamship Co., of New York, for a com-

bination of voyages which will land her in European waters. The management of the vessel continues to rest with the Columbia Pacific organization.

Delivery of the ship is to be made to the charterers at Norfolk, Va., where she will load coal for Havana, after which she will proceed to Port Arthur, Tex., in ballast, loading there for the River Plate, where another cargo will be awaiting her that is destined for the United Kingdom. Her movements beyond that have not been arranged for. The *Wanzu* loaded ties on Grays Harbor, getting to sea April 23, and she reported at Colon May 16, arriving at Philadelphia May 26.

"I consider the charter of the *Wanzu* for the trades indicated as the best illustration of the purposes for which the wooden steamers can be utilized," said A. C. Stubbe, manager of the Columbia Pacific. "Of course, we who have been in touch with ship construction in Oregon know the worth of these vessels, but the fact a New York steamship organization will take the steamer for such work, which means she will have to load various kinds of cargo, some of it being of a kind that could not be carried in a wooden bottom if there were any faulty hull features, is the best evidence of how Oregon-built ships are regarded."

#### NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5608) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was, on page 6, after line 3, to insert:

Investigation of fuel oil: For an investigation of fuel oil and gasoline adapted to naval requirements, including the question of supply and storage and the availability economically and otherwise of such supply as may be allowed by the naval reserves on the public domain, and for such other expenses for transportation and hire of vehicles in connection with naval petroleum reserves, as the Secretary of the Navy may deem appropriate, for the purchase of necessary instruments and appliances, for the extension of the naval fuel-oil testing plant at the navy yard, Philadelphia, Pa., and the temporary employment of civilian experts and assistants, \$60,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 1, after the word "purposes," to strike out "\$15,000,000" and insert "\$35,000,000," and in line 11, after "\$500," to insert "Provided further, That all claims adjusted under this authority during any fiscal year shall be reported in detail to the Congress by the Secretary of the Navy," so as to read:

Aviation, Navy: For aviation, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy for procuring, producing, constructing, operating, preserving, storing, and handling aircraft, establishment and maintenance of aircraft stations, for experimental work in development of aviation for naval purposes, and for the purchase or manufacture and issue of special clothing, wearing apparel, and similar equipment for aviation purposes, \$35,000,000: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy for drafting, clerical, inspection, and messenger service for aircraft stations shall not exceed \$300,000: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and pay out of this appropriation the amounts due on claims for damages which have occurred or may occur to private property growing out of the operations of naval aircraft, where such claim does not exceed the sum of \$500: *Provided further*, That all claims adjusted under this authority during any fiscal year shall be reported in detail to the Congress by the Secretary of the Navy: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for maintenance of more than six heavier-than-air stations on the coasts of continental United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 19, to insert:

For rehabilitating the island of Guam on account of typhoon of July 6, 1918, to be paid to and expended in the discretion of the governor of Guam, including the preservation from the weather, vermin, and insects of surplus crops and seed, the purchase of farming implements and farm machinery for use in and upon such public lands on the island of Guam as may be available and for rental thereof to natives desiring to utilize same, and for extending credits to native farmers, \$40,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PAGE. After line 3, on page 10, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have inserted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 10, after line 3, it is proposed to insert, as a separate paragraph, the following:

Until June 30, 1920, enlistments in the Navy may be for terms of from two, three, to four years, and all laws now applicable to four-year enlistments shall apply, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, to enlistments for a shorter period with proportionate benefits upon discharge and reenlistment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was, under the subhead "Bureau of Navigation," on page 10, line 11, after the words "per annum," to strike out "\$400,000" and insert "\$600,000," so as to make the clause read:

Recreation for enlisted men: For the recreation, amusement, comfort, contentment, and health of the Navy, and for such other purposes of like character as the Secretary of the Navy may deem advisable, to be expended in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, under such regulations as he may prescribe: *Provided*, That no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding \$1,800 per annum, \$600,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 15, to insert:  
Officers of the United States Naval Reserve Force who were transferred from the National Naval Volunteers under the provisions of the act of July 1, 1918, shall be paid the same uniform gratuity as other officers of the Naval Reserve Force: *Provided*, That they shall not have received from any State such gratuity.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 21, to insert:

Schools or camps of instruction: Naval Reserve Force: That of the unexpended and unobligated balance remaining of all money heretofore appropriated and of the appropriation authorized in Public No. 182, Sixty-fifth Congress, approved July 1, 1918, under the heading "Schools or camps of instruction, Naval Reserve Force, for assembling, training, and instructing recruits and reserves of all classes, including the crews of section patrols, submarines and submarine chasers, and beach patrol, and for all purposes connected therewith," \$500,000 is hereby reappropriated to defray the expenses incurred under existing law prior to September 1, 1919.

Mr. HARRISON. I wish to offer an amendment to the amendment, on lines 7 and 8, page 13, after the word "reappropriated," to strike out those two lines.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.  
The SECRETARY. On page 13, line 7, after the word "reappropriated," it is proposed to strike out the words "to defray the expenses incurred under existing law prior to September 1, 1919."

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, in support of the amendment to the committee amendment which I have offered, I will say that I feel quite sure that the Committee on Naval Affairs will not interpose an objection to it. There is a letter, I think addressed to the chairman of the committee from the Secretary of the Navy, which explains the fact that, if that limitation is placed in the provision, it will greatly cripple at least one or more of the training camps where these sailors are being demobilized, that it will be impossible to pay the obligations which have been incurred prior to September 1, and that it might affect the speedy demobilization of the sailors.

I hope the committee will accept the amendment I have offered. I will ask permission to insert a copy of the letter which came to the chairman of the committee, without reading it, as I do not wish to take the time of the Senate for that purpose.

Mr. PAGE. In order that the amendment may go to conference, I see no objection to accepting it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. HARRISON. I now ask that the letter to which I have referred and which was addressed to the chairman of the committee respecting the matter may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, permission is granted.

The letter referred to is as follows:

JUNE 25, 1919.

The honorable the CHAIRMAN OF THE  
SENATE COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I wish to invite your attention to the wording of the naval bill, H. R. 5608, as reported to the Senate, on page 13, line 8, which limits the time that the \$500,000 reappropriated under the caption "Schools or camps of instruction" will be available to September 1, 1919, and to request that this restriction be removed.

While all camps or schools of instruction may be closed by September 1, 1919, the final disposition of Government property and settlements relative thereto at these places will take a much longer time than the two months allowed.

The settlement of the college and university claims has been very slow, and it can not be stated definitely at this time when all these claims can be settled.

Further, owing to the very large number of men to be demobilized and recruited during the next fiscal year, it may be found advisable and advantageous to make use of one or more of these camps.

For the above reasons I request that on page 13, line 8, the words "prior to September 1, 1919," be stricken out.

Very sincerely, yours,

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed, as follows:

Naval training station, California: Maintenance of naval training station, Yerba Buena Island, Calif.: Labor and material; buildings and wharves; general care, repairs, and improvements of grounds, buildings, and wharves; wharfage, ferriage, and street car fare; purchase and maintenance of live stock, and attendance on same; motor-propelled vehicles, wagons, carts, implements, tools, and repairs to same, including the maintenance, repair, and operation of one motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle, to be used only for official purposes; fire engines and extinguishers; gymnastic implements, models, and other articles needed in instruction of apprentice seamen; printing outfit and materials, and maintenance of same; heating and lighting; stationery, books, schoolbooks, and periodicals; fresh water, and washing; packing boxes and materials; and all other contingent expenses; maintenance of dispensary building; lectures and suitable entertainments for apprentice seamen; in all, \$250,000.

Mr. PAGE. In printing the bill an error was made at the printing office. On page 14, line 2, I move, before the figures "\$250,000," that there be inserted, with a line through the type, "\$225,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.  
The SECRETARY. On page 14, line 2, after the word "all," it is proposed to insert "~~\$225,000~~" stricken through and insert "\$250,000" in italics.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was, on page 15, line 18, after the word "expenses," to insert "\$850,000; fuel, \$400,000," so as to read:

Naval training station, Great Lakes: Maintenance of naval training station: Labor and material; general care, repairs, and improvements of grounds, buildings, and piers; street car fare; purchase and maintenance of live stock, and attendance on same; motor-propelled vehicles, wagons, carts, implements, and tools, and repairs to same, including the maintenance, repair, and operation of one motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle, and one horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicle to be used only for official purposes; fire apparatus and extinguishers; gymnastic implements; models and other articles needed in instruction of apprentice seamen; printing outfit and material, and maintenance of same; heating and lighting, and repairs to power-plant equipment, distributing mains, tunnel, and conduits; stationery, books, schoolbooks, and periodicals; washing; packing boxes and materials; lectures and suitable entertainments for apprentice seamen; and all other contingent expenses, \$850,000; fuel, \$400,000.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, what reason was there for the House overlooking entirely an item which is apparently so indispensable?

Mr. PAGE. During the next fiscal year there will be approximately 100,000 recruits to be trained at the various training stations, which must be heated. This item was formerly under the cognizance of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, but it is now to be taken care of in one appropriation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was, on page 15, in line 23, after the words "Great Lakes," to strike out "\$850,000" and insert "\$1,250,000," so as to read:

*Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy for clerical, drafting, inspection, and messenger service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, shall not exceed \$6,000; in all, naval training station, Great Lakes, \$1,250,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 24, after the words "St. Helena," in the side heading, to insert "and naval operating base, Hampton Roads, Va.," and on page 16, line 4, after "\$310,000," to insert "fuel, \$440,000; in all, \$750,000," so as to make the clause read:

Naval training station, St. Helena, and naval operating base, Hampton Roads, Va.: Maintenance of naval training stations at St. Helena and at naval operating base, Virginia, labor and material, general care, repairs, and improvements; schoolbooks; and all other incidental expenses, \$310,000; fuel, \$440,000; in all, \$750,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 4, to insert:  
Naval reserve force: For expense of organizing, administering, and recruiting the naval reserve force, \$50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 7, to insert:

Naval detention training camp: Maintenance of naval detention training camp at naval barracks, Wissahickon, N. J.: labor and material, general care, repairs, heating and lighting, stationery, and other contingent expenses; in all, \$100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 12, to insert:

Receiving barracks: Maintenance of receiving barracks, \$250,000.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 16, line 13, it is proposed to strike out "\$250,000" and insert "\$500,000."

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, the Navy Department, as I understand, insists that the sum of \$250,000 will not be sufficient to maintain the receiving barracks. We have a great receiving barracks in New York, where most of the men are lodged during their stay on shore and while they are waiting to be transferred to ships. There are also a number of other barracks throughout the country. Of course, the Naval Committee knows more about this than I do, and if they think that the sum proposed to be appropriated is sufficient I shall not press my amendment.



Mr. PAGE. The amount carried by the bill for this item is all the department has asked for.

Mr. CALDER. I looked over the hearings, and it seemed to me that the department had asked for \$500,000. As I have stated, I will not, however, press the amendment if the Naval Affairs Committee feels the sum provided is sufficient, but it has been represented to me otherwise.

Mr. PAGE. In a letter from the Secretary this matter was specially referred to, and he asked for the \$250,000 appropriation and no more.

Mr. CALDER. Very well, I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was, on page 16, line 19, after the word "same," to strike out "\$55,250" and insert "\$82,750"; in line 21, after the words "War College," to strike out "\$300" and insert "\$1,200"; in line 24, after the word "periodicals," to strike out "\$1,300" and insert "\$5,000"; on page 17, line 3, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$22,500" and insert "\$50,000"; and in line 4, after the words "Rhode Island," to strike out "\$58,850" and insert "\$90,950," so as to make the clause read:

Naval War College, Rhode Island: For maintenance of the Naval War College on Coasters Harbor Island, including the maintenance, repair, and operation of one horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicle to be used only for official purposes; and care of grounds for same, \$82,750; services of a professor of international law, \$2,000; services of civilian lecturers, rendered at the War College, \$1,200; care and preservation of the library, including the purchase, binding, and repair of books of reference and periodicals, \$5,000: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy for clerical, inspection, drafting, and messenger service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, shall not exceed \$50,000; in all, Naval War College, Rhode Island, \$90,950.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 24, after the word "employees," to strike out "\$40,420" and insert "\$39,540," so as to make the clause read:

Naval Home, Philadelphia, Pa., pay of employees: One secretary, \$1,800; 1 foreman mechanic, \$1,800; 1 superintendent of grounds, at \$900; 1 steward, at \$900; 1 store laborer, at \$660; 1 matron and office assistant, at \$720; 1 beneficiaries' attendant, at \$480; 1 chief cook, at \$660; 1 assistant cook, at \$540; 1 assistant cook, at \$480; 1 chief laundress, at \$420; 2 laundresses, at \$360 each; 3 laundresses, at \$300 each; 1 chief scrubber, at \$420; 3 scrubbers, at \$360 each; 1 head waitress, at \$480; 4 waitresses, at \$360 each; 4 waitresses, at \$300 each; 1 kitchen attendant, at \$540; 7 laborers, at \$600 each; 5 laborers, at \$540 each; 1 stable keeper and driver, at \$660; 1 master at arms, at \$900; 2 house corporals, at \$600 each; 1 barber, at \$600; 1 carpenter, at \$1,200; 1 painter, at \$1,200; 1 painter, at \$1,020; 1 engineer, \$1,080; 4 laborers, at \$720 each; 3 laborers, at \$840 each; 1 laborer, at \$600; 1 chauffeur, coal truck, at \$960; 1 chauffeur, small truck, at \$840; 1 chauffeur, governor's car, \$840; total for employees, \$39,540.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 17, after the words "Naval Home," to strike out "\$145,786" and insert "\$144,906," so as to make the clause read:

Maintenance: Water rent, heating, and lighting; cemetery, burial expenses and headstones; general care and improvements of grounds, buildings, walls, and fences; repairs to power-plant equipment, implements, tools, and furniture, and purchase of the same; music in chapel and entertainments for beneficiaries; stationery, books, and periodicals; transportation of indigent and destitute beneficiaries to the Naval Home, and of sick and insane beneficiaries, their attendants and necessary subsistence for both, to and from other Government hospitals; employment of such beneficiaries in and about the Naval Home, as may be authorized by the Secretary of the Navy, on the recommendation of the governor; support of beneficiaries, and all other contingent expenses, including the maintenance, repair, and operation of one horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicle, two motor-propelled vehicles and one motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle, to be used only for official purposes, \$105,366; in all, Naval Home, \$144,906, which sum shall be paid out of the income from the naval pension fund.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 23, after the date "1919," to strike out "to December 31, 1919, to 191,000 men, and from January 1, 1920,"; in line 25, before the word "men," to strike out "170,000" and insert "191,000"; on page 19, line 3, after the word "members," to insert "and nurses"; in line 4, after the word "Force," to strike out "(other than commissioned and warrant officers)" and insert "in enlisted ratings as"; in line 15, before the word "number," to strike out "total" and insert "average"; in the same line, before the word "officers," to insert "commissioned"; in line 16, after the word "and," to strike out "reserve" and insert "reserves, on active duty"; and in line 20, after the word "Force," to strike out "(other than commissioned and warrant officers)" and insert "in enlisted ratings," so as to make the clause read:

The total authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Navy is hereby temporarily increased from 131,485 during the period from July 1, 1913, to September 30, 1919, to 241,000 men, and from October 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, to 191,000 men, and the Secretary of the

Navy is hereby authorized to call to or continue on active service on strictly naval duties, with their consent, such numbers of the male members and nurses of the Naval Reserve Force in enlisted ratings as may be necessary to supply deficiencies to maintain the total authorized strength for the periods herein authorized. The foregoing total authorized strength shall include the hospital corps, apprentice seamen, those sentenced by court-martial to discharge, enlisted men of the Flying Corps, those under instruction in trade schools, and members of the Naval Reserve Force so serving. That during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, no member of the Naval Reserve Force shall be recalled to active duty for training or any other purpose except as hereinbefore provided: *Provided*, That the average number of commissioned officers of the line, permanent, temporary, and reserves, on active duty shall not exceed during the periods aforesaid 4 per cent of the total temporary authorized enlisted strength of the Regular and Temporary Navy and members of the Naval Reserve Force in enlisted ratings on active duty, and the number of staff officers shall be in the same proportion as provided under existing law: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed as affecting the permanent, commissioned, or enlisted strength of the Regular Navy as authorized by existing law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 3, after the word "members," to insert "except nurses"; in line 6, before the word "days," to strike out "30" and insert "90"; and in line 11, before the word "days," to strike out "30" and insert "90," so as to make the clause read:

Female members, except nurses, of the Naval Reserve Force and the Marine Corps Reserve shall, as soon as practicable and in no event later than 90 days after the date of approval of this act, be placed on inactive duty. Members of the Naval Reserve Force shall not hereafter be ordered to perform active duty on shore of a kind which is ordinarily performed by civilians, and all reservists now performing such duty shall be relieved from such duty within 90 days after the date of approval of this act.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee to explain the significance of this amendment, why it increases the number of days to 90, and what is the reason of the exception of nurses from the operation of the proposed provision?

Mr. PAGE. It is absolutely imperative that the nurses be retained on active duty for some time to come on account of the large number of sick and wounded men who must be cared for.

On account of the great amount of clerical work incident to immediate discharge of a large number of men it was urgently requested by the department that this period be extended to 90 days.

Mr. SWANSON. Unless nurses were excluded from this provision all the female nurses in the Reserve Force at hospitals and elsewhere would be precluded from being employed by the Navy, and would go out with the clerical force doing clerical work in the department. It is practically impossible to conduct the hospitals in Newport, New York, and Norfolk without having some female nurses, and if this provision excepting female nurses in the Naval Reserve Force is not put in, every nurse in these naval hospitals will be discharged.

Mr. KING. In the case of hospitals, is it the purpose to retain the same number of nurses that existed during the war, regardless of the necessities?

Mr. SWANSON. Oh, no; we limit the number of people for all purposes in the Navy, and they can not exceed that number.

Mr. KING. Is there any limitation upon the number of nurses?

Mr. SWANSON. The nurse force and all forces in the Navy are limited in this bill, and in fact reduced.

Mr. KING. I saw no limitation upon the civilian employees.

Mr. SWANSON. Oh, the Nurse Corps and the Hospital Corps and all the corps in the Navy are limited.

Mr. KING. I knew that many were, but I saw no limitation upon this.

Mr. SWANSON. Oh, they are limited. We could not employ an unlimited number; but the entire hospital force would be absolutely demoralized if this should not be done. The 90-day provision is put there because they say that these women who are now in the Navy will be transferred, as far as they are needed, to the civil service, and it will take about 90 days to accomplish that. A great many of them will be able to stand the examination, and will be transferred; and the committee thought it was better to change it from 30 days to 90. They will not have any more than needed, because, under the civil-service law, there can not be any more clerks, and so forth, than are required. This simply extends the time for the transfer and the demobilization of the women in the reserve force from 30 days to 90 days.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was, on page 21, line 5, after the word "thereof," to strike out "\$8,613,220" and insert "\$8,263,220"; in line 12, after the

word "paragraph," to insert "except expert technicians"; and in line 14, after the words "District of Columbia," to insert "Provided further, That not more than 24 employees shall be so appointed at a compensation exceeding \$2,000 per annum, and that in no case shall the compensation exceed \$4,000 per annum," so as to make the clause read:

Members of the Naval Reserve Force and Marine Corps Reserve who accept such temporary civil appointments shall be given an opportunity to qualify by a civil-service examination for certification in accordance with civil-service rules to fill such vacancies as may occur, in cases where they are not already eligible for appointment or reinstatement. All temporary appointments made hereunder shall terminate not later than June 30, 1920. For pay of reservists so transferred to the civil establishment, or civil-service employees appointed in lieu thereof, \$8,263.220, their pay prior to transfer to be charged to the appropriation "Pay of the Navy," and the Secretary of the Navy shall submit to Congress on the first day of the next regular session a statement showing the number and designation of the persons employed hereunder and the rate of compensation paid to each: *Provided*, That no employee paid under the provisions of this paragraph, except expert technicians, shall receive annual compensation in excess of \$2,000 for services rendered in the Navy Department, Washington, D. C.: *Provided further*, That not more than 24 employees shall be so appointed at a compensation exceeding \$2,000 per annum, and that in no case shall the compensation exceed \$4,000 per annum.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 4, to strike out:

The act of April 16, 1918 (Public, No. 129), granting under certain conditions, to every commissioned officer of the Army the right to quarters in kind for their dependents or the authorized commutation therefor, including the allowances for heat and light, shall hereafter be construed to apply to officers of the Navy and Marine Corps only who are serving in the field as part of the American Expeditionary Forces under the jurisdiction of the War Department.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 18, after the word "Navy," to strike out "and Marine Corps," so as to make the clause read:

The rates of pay prescribed in section 15 of an act entitled "An act to temporarily increase the commissioned and warrant and enlisted strength of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1917, are hereby made the permanent rates of pay of the enlisted men of the Navy during their present current enlistment and for those who enlist or reenlist prior to July 1, 1920, for the term of such enlistment or reenlistment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 21, to insert:

That officers who have served satisfactorily during the war with the German Government in a temporary grade or rank shall be eligible for selection for promotion and for promotion to the same permanent grade or rank until July 1, 1920, without regard to statutory requirements other than professional and physical examinations.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 2, to insert:

Any officer with the permanent rank of rear admiral who has heretofore served a full term and is now serving as chief of any bureau of the Navy Department shall be credited with service for all purposes as provided by section 1486 of the Revised Statutes, and nothing herein contained shall operate to increase the rank or pay of any such officer as now authorized by law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 18, after the word "Navy," to insert "and members of the Naval Reserve Force on active duty" so as to make the clause read:

Section 1 of the act entitled "An act to increase the number of midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy," approved December 20, 1917, is hereby amended so as to read as follows: That hereafter there shall be allowed at the United States Naval Academy five midshipmen for each Senator, Representative, Delegate in Congress, and Resident Commissioner from Porto Rico, and five for the District of Columbia, 15 appointed each year at large, and 100 appointed annually from enlisted men of the Navy, and members of the Naval Reserve Force on active duty, as now authorized by law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 2, to insert:

That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to investigate the representations of the hardships and losses sustained by the occupants of certain premises within the naval station at Pensacola, Fla., who were required by an order recently issued by the Secretary of the Navy to give up such premises and remove their dwellings, buildings, and other property therefrom in order that room might be made for the aeronautic station, and the said Secretary is further authorized and directed to allow in such of said cases as are meritorious, and may in his judgment be deserving of relief, reasonable compensation for losses and injuries sustained by reason of removals necessitated by the department's said order, and there is hereby appropriated, out of money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$30,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to pay such sums as the Secretary of the Navy may award and allow hereunder.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, after line 10, to insert:

That for particularly meritorious service performed during the present war by Capt. William R. Rush, United States Navy, retired, on active duty as commandant of the navy yard at Boston, Mass., the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to nominate and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint the said William

R. Rush a rear admiral on the active list of the United States Navy, to take rank immediately after Rear Admiral James H. Glennon: *Provided*, That the said William R. Rush shall be carried as additional to the number of rear admirals now authorized by law.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee or the Senator from Virginia if this is the usual method by which men are transferred to the rear admirals' list to a number in excess of the general statute? Is it the usual way to carry in appropriation bills special legislation to advance some persons in the Navy to higher rank? It seems to me there ought to be general legislation rather than specific legislation dealing with these cases.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, this is an amendment in which the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is especially interested. I shall be glad to have it passed over until he returns, if the Senator is willing.

Mr. KING. I think the next one, also, had better be passed over, then.

Mr. PAGE. And the next one, commencing on line 22.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, does the Senator object to the provision beginning on line 9, page 30? I hope not. That is a very meritorious case.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like an explanation as to those three items. I do not know that I shall have objection to either.

The only point in my mind was whether it was wise to have special legislation to deal with these cases. There ought to be some general statute which permits, under peculiar circumstances, increase in rank or elevation to some higher position.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, the only way in which people can be recognized for special meritorious service is by Congress. People get their promotions, as the Senator from Utah has suggested, in the regular order prescribed by law. The only way in which a person can get a special promotion for specially meritorious service is by an act of Congress.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] presented this matter to the committee. Capt. Rush had done special work at the Boston Navy Yard. He had been retired by the plucking board in a way that left some doubt as to whether he should not have been permitted to continue. This old plucking board retired him. When the war broke out he was called to the Boston Navy Yard, which is one of the largest activities of the Navy, and he made a splendid officer. It is a great navy yard. He made a great success there; and this practically restores him to what he would have had otherwise, except for the action of the plucking board, I think.

Mr. PAGE. And may I suggest to the Senator that this action is urged by a special resolution of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts?

Mr. SWANSON. Yes; he was so efficient there that the legislature of that State asked to have him restored. As I understand, this restores him to what he would have had if the plucking board had not retired him. Under the old law they had to retire so many officers each year, whether they were efficient or inefficient. The law required them to retire 8, 10, 15, or 20 officers, and the plucking board retired this man. When the war came on the naval authorities wanted an efficient, strong, aggressive man at the head of the naval activities at Boston, and they put Capt. Rush there; and, if I understand correctly from the statement of the Senator from Massachusetts—and he is generally very accurate—this provision simply entitles him to have what he otherwise would have had if the plucking board had not retired him. We felt that when a man comes into the Navy during a war, and does war work, and does it splendidly, and the Navy needs him, he ought to have an opportunity to get what he otherwise would have had if this plucking board, the act creating which we have repealed, had not acted. It is left to the President. It does not direct it to be done. It says that the President is authorized—and he could not do it unless we authorized it—to consider the facts in this case, and if he thinks it is meritorious he can make this officer a rear admiral.

As to the other case, from lines 9 to 21, page 30, First Sergt. Edgar Hayes, we went into that very thoroughly. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] was very much interested in that matter. Hayes was a retired marine officer. The facts are that though he was retired he went into active service. He was at a station, and some man reflected on the uniform—said he was going into disgraceful work in enlisting in the Navy—and he became very much enraged, and attacked this citizen, which was contrary to the regulations of the Navy. He was then court-martialed, and the court-martial had to find the facts, that he attacked a citizen for insulting the Navy and the uniform, and they unanimously recommended clemency to this man. The recommendation was not followed; and this man then enlisted as a private. He served during the war, and he



was an officer. We felt that after a man had enlisted as a private when the board had recommended clemency, and his only offense was that he had violated the rule, which the court was bound to find, by resenting an insult to the uniform, and after he had served through the war as a private he was entitled to be reinstated to the position he had at the time; and the committee was unanimous in making this recommendation.

Mr. KING. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, let me add that Sergt. Hayes is a citizen of my city and State, and I know the facts to be as stated. The offense for which he was degraded was one for which he should have been promoted. He resented an insult to the uniform in a way which was prohibited, and of course properly so, by the regulations. As a result he lost his position, and then enlisted, and his service has been so good that he is now First Sergt. Edgar Hayes.

Let me add merely this—that this provision does not restore him to the position he undoubtedly would now have, but puts him at the end of the grade, so that the restoration is only partial after all.

Mr. SWANSON. I should like to say in this connection, Mr. President—

Mr. KING. I have no objection to the item.

Mr. SWANSON. I should like to say that the only way in which relief can be given in these cases is by a separate bill or by putting them on an appropriation bill. The separate bills very rarely pass; and we may have in the coming bills, now and hereafter, some cases where hardships like this exist, which we are bound to correct, and the only way in which you can get efficient legislation is to put them on appropriation bills.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I was not here when the matter of Capt. Rush came up, and I know the ground has been entirely covered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON]; but as Capt. Rush has been on duty at the Boston Navy Yard, I desire to say just a few words in regard to him.

The Boston yard is a very large and important yard, and had an immense burden of work during the war. Nothing could exceed the success of the administration of Capt. Rush. The Chief of Operations, Admiral Benson, praised the administration of the yard in the highest terms. I have seen a letter from the Secretary, in which he spoke in the same high terms of Capt. Rush's work; and, what is somewhat unusual, I have received letters and petitions on the subject from the great working force of the yard. He not only managed the yard admirably well, but he had the support of all the mechanical force in it; and, what is still more unusual, his administration there was so successful that the legislature passed resolutions of commendation when his term expired.

Capt. Rush is a very fine officer. He has done a great work. The reason of the action of the plucking board has been explained. I think the provision which it is proposed to make in his case is very well deserved, and ought to be carried in the bill. It is practically the only way to meet these cases.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was, on page 29, after line 21, to insert:

That the provisions of the law regulating appointments in the Navy are hereby suspended for the purpose of this act only, and only so far as they affect Frank Pulaski; and the President of the United States is hereby authorized, in the exercise of his discretion and judgment, to appoint Frank Pulaski, late a Lieutenant, junior grade, United States Naval Reserve Force, to the same grade and rank as of the date of April 14, 1919, and to place him on the inactive service list as of the date of April 14, 1919: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed to entitle the said Frank Pulaski to any back pay, allowances, or other emoluments by reason of the passage of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 8, to insert:

That the President is hereby authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as a first lieutenant in the permanent establishment of the United States Marine Corps, First Sergt. Edgar Hayes, United States Marine Corps, to be an extra number in that grade and in any grade to which he may hereafter be promoted: *Provided*, That the said Edgar Hayes shall establish to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Navy his mental, moral, physical, and professional qualifications to perform all the duties of said grade: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to entitle the said Edgar Hayes to any back pay, allowances, or other emoluments by reason of the passage of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Works, Bureau of Yards and Docks," on page 35, after line 12, to insert:

To aid in construction of bridge connecting city of Portsmouth, N. H., with navy yard at Kittery, Me., \$500,000, of which \$250,000 is hereby appropriated: *Provided*, That an equal amount shall be ex-

pended concurrently for the same purpose severally by the States of Maine and New Hampshire, the location to be approved by the Secretary of the Navy for convenient access to the Portsmouth Navy Yard.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, referring to the words "that an equal amount shall be expended concurrently," does that refer to the \$250,000 or the \$500,000?

Mr. HALE. I think that refers to the \$500,000.

Mr. PHELAN. If it is so intended, I have no objection.

Mr. HALE. It is so intended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was, on page 35, line 23, after "\$500,000," to insert "new power plant, \$1,000,000," and in line 24, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$540,000" and insert "\$1,540,000," so as to make the clause read:

Navy yard, Boston, Mass.: Two 25-ton floating derricks, \$40,000; shore facilities for Commonwealth Dry Dock, South Boston, \$500,000; new power plant, \$1,000,000; in all, \$1,540,000.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee whether this new power plant is needed at this time.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am perhaps more familiar with it as it relates to the Boston yard.

This appropriation was placed in the bill last March by a unanimous vote of the committee after hearing very fully from the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks in regard to it. The present power plant in that yard—which, as I have already stated, is a very large and busy yard—was placed very unfortunately at the extreme end of the yard, involving great expense and difficulty in the transportation of material and of coal. The space is entirely inadequate. They have made one addition, and I think two additions. There is no room for further additions. They must have a larger power plant sooner or later, and in fact they must have it sooner—very soon. The money now spent on that plant, as the commandant of the yard and the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks testified, is a practical waste, for sooner or later they must have a larger power plant.

This plan is to build a new power plant nearer the center of the yard accessible from all points. Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars will be needed at once for an additional compressed-air tunnel for the present power plant. All of the machinery that is in the present power plant can be used. The loss is only in the building. There was \$400,000 appropriated, I think, in the last bill for new machinery. They have only purchased a portion of it, because they regard the plant as it now stands as so insufficient; but what has been purchased can all be used in the new plant. It is nothing but the merest good economy to make this appropriation and build this new power plant, which must come sooner or later; and if it is not appropriated for there will be large sums of money spent on the present power plant which will be practically thrown away.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Is the \$1,000,000 merely for the erection of the building or to purchase additional equipment?

Mr. LODGE. There will be additional equipment. There must be.

Mr. KING. Will that be embraced in this appropriation?

Mr. LODGE. That is embraced within it. It embraces everything.

Mr. KING. I asked the question because it seemed to me that \$1,000,000 would be entirely too much for a mere building.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no; it is not for a mere building, of course. I was merely pointing out that they could use the old machinery; but they will have to move the machinery, and they will have to buy additional equipment, and, of course, make the compressed-air tunnels and the necessary means of running the power plant.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was, at the top of page 36, to insert:

Navy yard, New York, N. Y.: Steel storage, \$250,000.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, just what does that mean?

Mr. PAGE. That means that at the Brooklyn Navy Yard the necessities are very pressing. They ought to have a place to store steel. The matter has been estimated for, and very carefully taken up by the committee, and it was unanimously approved.

Mr. THOMAS. The expression is a little bit ambiguous.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was, on page 36, line 7, after "\$100,000," to insert "general development for handling guns, armor, turrets, structural steel, \$1,000,000; central power-plant improvements and distributing systems, \$500,000; light machine shop, \$400,000; pattern shop and storage, \$400,000"; and in line 11, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$1,500,000" and insert "\$3,800,000," so as to make the clause read:

Navy yard, Philadelphia, Pa.: Dry dock, to complete, and the limit of cost is increased to \$4,700,000, \$1,200,000; paving, railroad tracks, sewers, water pipes, and general yard developments, \$200,000; kapok mattress and life-preserver factory, \$100,000; general development for handling guns, armor, turrets, structural steel, \$1,000,000; central power plant improvements and distributing systems, \$500,000; light machine shop, \$400,000; pattern shop and storage, \$400,000; in all, \$3,800,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator explain these large items of additions?

Mr. PAGE. As I understand, this is practically a new program, and is to proceed with the building of new ships at the Philadelphia Navy Yard—two battle cruisers. I have here a letter from Secretary Daniels, of which one paragraph reads as follows:

The first item is considered an important one in order to increase the facilities of the navy yard, Philadelphia, for the construction of capital ships. The principal structure to be provided under this item is a turret shop which will permit the construction and complete erection of turrets under one roof by means of adequate weight-handling facilities. With the increased size of turrets and the corresponding increased weight, it is essential that additional facilities of this type be provided. This yard is also without adequate facilities for the general storage of armor, guns, and structural steel, all of which is essential for the economical construction of capital ships.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, the Boston yard and the Philadelphia yard and the Norfolk yard are the yards in which a large amount of construction is going on to complete the ships that are under contract now. The Philadelphia yard, I suppose, has more ships under construction than anywhere else, and next to that is the Norfolk yard. The building ways are there, the material has been assembled; and in order to construct economically what the Government has undertaken there you have got to have a pattern shop, you have got to have storage for the steel, you have got to have cranes; and every one of these yards where we have provided for the construction of power plants has been earnestly recommended by the department. They appeared before us and insisted that they could not promptly and economically complete the program which they have under process of construction there unless this is done.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question? This relates to the Philadelphia yard?

Mr. SWANSON. Yes.

Mr. POMERENE. The Senator is not asking anything for Virginia, is he?

Mr. SWANSON. I will discuss that matter when we get to it; but I will say to the Senator that I think this is just as important; I make no distinction as to whether it is in Philadelphia or Norfolk if it is necessary to construct this Navy that is in process of construction. You must remember that none of these vessels are being constructed in private yards. They are being constructed in navy yards. The Government navy yards can not construct these ships unless they have efficient means of doing it.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator, before he takes his seat, if the same naval authorities made this recommendation who last year recommended the appropriation of \$3,000,000, I think, for building a dry dock in Charleston Harbor and the appropriation of a similar amount of money for the purpose of dredging a channel to the dry dock?

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, that has been settled—not last year, but it has already been settled.

Mr. THOMAS. I understand that it is settled. I merely wanted to know if it was the same authority recommending this that recommended that.

Mr. SWANSON. This has been recommended both by the Construction Board, by the Bureau of Yards and Docks, and by the Secretary of the Navy. If you can construct battle cruisers that cost \$35,000,000 without machine shops, without pattern shops, without power, without the incidentals that everybody else has, all right; but it will be utterly impossible to do so economically.

Mr. THOMAS. I think that is true.

Mr. SWANSON. All of these appropriations are limited. None of the money is for the purchase of land. We have confined it absolutely to what the department stated was absolutely necessary to complete the work they have undertaken.

Mr. THOMAS. I think that is true; but the remarkable thing about it is that we have appropriated moneys for these huge vessels upon the assumption that we have the facilities for their construction, and we have been assured that a number of them were in process of construction. Personally, I have never changed my opinion with regard to the wisdom of these appropriation for large-ship construction. I believe the day has come when, figuratively at least, they will rapidly be doomed, as the fleet recently sunk in Scapa Flow was doomed. We build these dreadnought battleships to meet a supposed or actual menace to the country or to some of its interests, and then we cast them aside when they are completed in order to make room for what are said to be equally essential and important appropriations for additional vessels.

I clipped this statement from a Washington paper only a few days ago.

12 OLD WARSHIPS DOOMED—PREDREADNOUGHT BATTLESHIPS DESTINED BY NAVY FOR JUNK OR TARGETS.

Twelve predreadnought battleships will be relieved of active duty with the fleet, placed out of commission, and probably eventually broken up for junk or used as targets under plans now being worked out by the Navy Department. The ships are of the "mixed-battery" type, and are not considered to be of any value against latest type fighting craft.

Four of the battleships—the historic squadron comprising the *Oregon*, *Indiana*, *Iowa*, and *Massachusetts*—have already been relegated to the scrap heap. The remaining eight, apparently doomed to the same fate, are the *Kearsarge*, *Kentucky*, *Illinois*, *Alabama*, *Wisconsin*, *Maine*, *Missouri*, and *Ohio*.

The twelve vessels, built between 1893 and 1901, represent a total expenditure for hulls and machinery alone of more than \$335,000,000. When placed out of commission, they will release for other duty approximately 10,000 enlisted men and nearly 400 officers.

And so, Mr. President, the procession goes. The ships for which we must construct additional building facilities will be constructed only to follow the fate of those the list of which I have just read. It may be good business; it may be necessary for the protection of the country's affairs that this shall continue, but to my mind it is an entirely needless and wasteful expenditure of money, particularly in view of developments that are now being made in aircraft, which ultimately will make nearly all types of surface warships practically obsolete.

I shall not oppose this appropriation, but I am not at all impressed with the fact that we should make it because some of the officials of the Navy Department have recommended that the appropriation be made now.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to one matter which has been brought to my attention. I am not sure that the complaint which has been made to me involves the item which is now under consideration, but it has been reported to me that bids have been asked from these various Government yards for the construction of vessels, and there is a sort of rivalry, whether real or imaginary I am not able to state, between these Government-owned and Government-conducted yards with respect to the obtaining of contracts to construct vessels. The charge is made, or the statement is made, that after some of these bids have been made and contracts awarded appeals are made to Congress to improve the facilities in one of the yards, perhaps the yard that got the contract, and anticipating that it was going to get improved facilities and larger appropriations it made a better showing in the bid than one of the competing yards, and this has led, as I am advised, to some criticism and some complaint. Of course, the result of that procedure inevitably leads to a demand by the other yard or yards, if not in the then pending bill, in the next appropriation bill for larger appropriations in order that the other yards may make a lower bid and thus compete successfully with the yard that got the large appropriation at the preceding Congress.

Mr. PAGE. Answering the Senator from Utah, I can say that I understand every Government yard to-day is full to its capacity building these ships. There is no proposal to build any ships except to complete what is known as the program of 1916.

In providing, as we do, for the additions to be made to the navy yard in Philadelphia, and I also might add the navy yard at Norfolk, we are doing now only what seems to be absolutely necessary for economic and speedy construction, according to the best information we can get. I am not prepared to enter into a scientific consideration of the question suggested by the Senator from Utah, but speaking specifically with regard to the amendment now before us, I think I may say that we have no testimony and no letter from any department that does not fully justify the increase we are seeking to make at Philadelphia and at Norfolk.



Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I should like to say that while we do request the Government navy yards to make an estimate as to what a ship will probably cost, all the work is done on account of the Government. We used to have work done by private yards, which the yards have not been very desirous of doing for several years, and when the question came up as to whether it should be assigned to a Government yard to build the ship or to a private yard, it partook more of the nature of a contract for the Government yard at that time than it does now. We asked the Government yard to make an estimate of what a battleship would cost. We would open those bids, and we had a right to reject either one, and frequently, not now, but at that time, the Government yards did make estimates a little less than the ship would really cost. But now these ships are assigned to navy yards, and they have been taxed to their utmost capacity for two years on account of war conditions. The ships are in various stages of construction, and they can not be completed without providing these instrumentalities. All the work done at the navy yard is done at the expense of the Government. If you have not the proper facilities, if you have no cranes, if you have not the power on a ship being constructed at the expense of the Government you lose by lack of efficiency.

Admiral Taylor, who I think is one of the greatest naval constructors in the world, who certainly has a reputation equal to any, has gone over these estimates carefully as to what is needed for construction. The matter of construction is under him, and he and the Secretary believe there is a necessity for the construction of these ships, and have stated that it is absolutely necessary and that the Government will save money by getting these modern methods of construction at the yards where the construction of these ships is to be carried on.

Mr. THOMAS. This is another instance where the Government saves money by expending it.

Mr. SWANSON. Any man would save money if he were constructing a ship by having tools instead of relying on day labor. The entire purchase of machinery shows that you do save money by spending money for machinery. If the Senator from Colorado is correct, we ought not to have any machinery to do the sawing, no machinery to do the drilling, but we should do it all by hand. However, the experience of the world has shown that machinery saves money. This appropriation is simply to equip the Government yards equal to the private yards.

Mr. THOMAS. What I dislike is the fact that with every appropriation for new ships we have to furnish new machinery.

Mr. SWANSON. I suppose in the Philadelphia yard we have several hundred million tons under construction. It is simply a business proposition. Will you furnish machinery and tools to do that work economically, efficiently, and promptly, with what everybody is using in that business, or will you not? The department thinks that this is economy and adds to efficiency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 23, after "\$25,000," to insert "addition to power plant, \$200,000; in all, \$225,000," so as to make the clause read:

Buildings and grounds, Naval Academy: Repair of roads, \$25,000; addition to power plant, \$200,000; in all, \$225,000.

Mr. THOMAS. May I ask the Senator from Virginia if this is another instance in which provision for machinery is necessary to economy and for the efficiency of the cadets?

Mr. SWANSON. We have enlarged the academy at Annapolis. We have increased the number of students there to double and treble what it was. We have the buildings, and there is very little reason for having the buildings without heating them.

Mr. THOMAS. That was done some two or three years ago.

Mr. SWANSON. We have not yet completed the buildings. I see no reason for having buildings at the Naval Academy for two or three thousand cadets which they can not occupy for lack of heat. If the Senator thinks that wise—

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, no; I am asking for information. I recall that we made the appropriations, I think, in the last naval bill because of the increased capacity for the purposes of the war.

Mr. SWANSON. This is to build a power plant in the building we have constructed. We did not want to appropriate for a power plant before we constructed the building.

Mr. THOMAS. The House, of course, gave careful consideration to the bill before it was reported from the committee there and before it was passed. These additions are made here I presume because the House failed to do it. I imagine the House must have had some good reason, sufficient to themselves at least, for not making these appropriations.

Mr. PAGE. If the Senator will allow me—

Mr. THOMAS. If it is necessary, I shall not object to it.

Mr. PAGE. I should like to read just one sentence from a letter received from the Secretary of the Navy. He says:

The power plant at Annapolis has been found to be inadequate for the service required after the additions already made to the buildings of the academy, such as Isherwood Hall and Bancroft Hall, and two temporary boilers have been installed. Before the completion of the Seamanship Building permanent boilers of larger capacities, with coal-handling apparatus, should be made available, and this will require a sufficient addition to the building to accommodate the new apparatus. It is recommended, therefore, for your consideration that an amendment be made to the pending naval bill to provide \$200,000 for an addition to the power plant at the Naval Academy.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not object to the appropriation. I merely wish to call attention, while I am on the floor, to the fact, however, that the navy yards at Philadelphia, and at Boston, and at Mare Island, Calif., and Norfolk, Va., all seem to be suffering from a lack of machinery, which I suppose economy requires that we shall supply, the totals of which amount well up toward \$10,000,000.

Mr. SWANSON. I should like to say to the Senator that at all these yards the amount of construction has been more than doubled. There is no occasion to buy the additional machinery when you are constructing but one battleship in the yards, but when you put two battleships there to be constructed you need that much more machinery.

I will say in justice to the department and to the committee, we have insisted that nothing shall be included in this bill that is not absolutely necessary to complete the construction under way. The Senator knows well that as we increase the number of ships of various sizes at these yards, we are bound to increase the machinery.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, yes.

Mr. SWANSON. And it is not proposed to increase the machinery in these yards to a greater extent than the construction program requires.

Mr. THOMAS. I also know the argument which has been used in regard to appropriations on previous naval bills and Army bills and other bills is that the appropriations are absolutely necessary. Of course, if they are they should be made, but when one takes the statements running over a number of years showing the aggregate annual appropriations for these various items, which continue year after year, we are appalled by their magnitude. It seems to me machinery wears out faster and becomes obsolete more rapidly when used by the Government than when used anywhere else.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 5, after "\$75,000," to insert "machine and electrical shop building, \$400,000; pattern shop and storage, \$400,000; steel and lumber storage, to complete, \$300,000," and in line 7, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$825,000" and insert "\$1,925,000," so as to make the clause read:

Navy Yard, Norfolk, Va.: Water-front improvements, \$500,000; tracks, streets, and sewers, \$100,000; auxiliary fitting-out cranes, \$100,000; grading Schmoele tract, \$25,000; dispensary, \$25,000; paint and oil storehouse, \$75,000; machine and electrical shop building, \$400,000; pattern shop and storage, \$400,000; steel and lumber storage, to complete, \$300,000; in all, \$1,925,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading was continued to line 18, page 37.

Mr. KING. Perhaps, under the rule which obtains, inquiries as to matters which are not amendments are not permissible now, but recurring to an item which has just been read, I should like to make an inquiry now. I notice an appropriation here for the navy yard at Charleston, S. C.:

Dredging, to continue, \$30,000; air compressors and auxiliaries, \$118,000; oxyacetylene plant, \$25,000; fire protection, \$50,000; in all, \$223,000.

I recall that when a prior appropriation bill was under consideration there was some discussion as to the wisdom of continuing the plant at Charleston. The limited information which was then vouchsafed to Members who challenged this item was not at all satisfactory to me that this expenditure was prudent. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] has just called attention to the facts with regard to this item, that you have to dredge in order to reach the place where the dry dock is to be constructed.

I was not permitted to attend all the hearings of the committee, owing to my being required to attend other committee hearings, and I was wondering if the question has been considered by the committee of retaining this plant at Charleston. It seems to me in the light of information we had a year or two ago and in the light of the fact that we have so greatly increased other plants and the facilities in the other plants, there ought

to be some reconsideration of the determination to build a dry dock or to construct a plant at Charleston, and that it ought to be abandoned.

Mr. PAGE. If the Senator please, we have a unanimous-consent agreement not to take up such matters until we have completed the committee amendments. Would it be just as satisfactory to the Senator to reserve his inquiry and take up this item later?

Mr. KING. Certainly. I stated at the outset that perhaps this was in violation of the understanding.

Mr. PAGE. I wish that might be done, because I should like first to complete the reading of the bill and action upon the committee amendments.

Mr. KING. I shall have no objection to that course.

Mr. SWANSON. This appropriation does not take care of the dock. The only dispute about the Charleston Navy Yard was with reference to the dry dock to be erected there. The dredging has always been necessary.

Mr. THOMAS. Do you mean to say we have always had to dredge there?

Mr. SWANSON. We have always had to dredge to some extent, like we do at most harbors. Whether you have to dredge deep enough to permit the largest battleship to go in there is another question. We have spent \$9,000,000 in the construction of the navy yard at Charleston. It has activities of various kinds and character. I do not suppose in 20 years anybody ever advocated abolishing the yard. It is absolutely indispensable. The only question that has ever been subject to debate is whether we should put a dry dock there so that the largest battleship could come into it.

Mr. POMERENE. If I may ask the Senator in charge of the bill a question, How much is it going to cost the Government or has it cost the Government to dredge out this harbor so as to permit the sending of a large battleship to the dry dock?

Mr. PAGE. I do not know. I am not well informed on the subject.

Mr. SMOOT. It has not been dredged. An appropriation was made for the purpose in the last river and harbor bill.

Mr. POMERENE. What was the amount of the appropriation?

Mr. SMOOT. Something like \$3,000,000.

Mr. SWANSON. Oh, no; not for dredging.

Mr. SMOOT. It was quite a large sum.

Mr. SWANSON. It was the usual appropriation for the purpose there. The river comes in and fills up some every year, but all the dredging that was to be done there was not for the dry dock.

Mr. POMERENE. I want to suggest, if there is a matter of several million dollars to be expended for the making of a harbor into which can float big battleships, it is well enough to consider these other minor matters, too.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no doubt but what the appropriation was made for that purpose. We fought it out upon the floor of the Senate here as vigorously as we could, but you can not get anything out of a river and harbor bill. It covers all the States of the Union.

Mr. POMERENE. It is possible, even by an amendment to this bill, to repeal that.

Mr. SMOOT. That is true, but I doubt whether you could get the vote to do it.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 20, after "\$100,000," to insert "replacing two temporary marine barracks, \$30,000; in all, \$130,000," so as to make the clause read:

Navy yard, Mare Island, Calif.: Maintenance of dikes and dredging, \$100,000; replacing two temporary marine barracks, \$30,000; in all, \$130,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, after line 21, to insert:

For purchase of right of way and for construction of railroad connection between causeway now crossing Mare Island Straits and the South Vallejo railroad yards, \$165,000.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator having the bill in charge if it is not rather unwise to stipulate the payment of an exact amount for right of way unless an agreement has been entered into and we are merely carrying out an executory contract? If we make an appropriation of \$165,000 to acquire a right of way, certainly the man who has the ground will insist upon the payment of \$165,000. If there is no contract and you are making the appropriation for the purpose of securing the right of way, there ought to be some restriction on the payment and there ought not to be a lump sum appropriated absolutely. There ought to be inserted the qualifying words "or so much thereof as may be necessary."

Mr. PAGE. I think myself it might very properly be amended by inserting "not exceeding" that sum. I wish to say concern-

ing this amendment that the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] is present and knows all the facts connected with the matter and he can speak authoritatively about it.

Mr. PHELAN. This item was recommended by the Secretary of the Navy and explained by Admiral Parks before the committee. It seems that the Government now pays \$80,000 a year for lighterage. So two years' charges for lighterage would pay the cost of the right of way and construction of this railroad to the end of the present causeway to South Vallejo, which enables the Government to bring in its heavy materials without incurring either the delay or the cost of lighterage. So it is money made, as the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] said, for the Government to construct this uncompleted railroad. The causeway is now there across the stream. The lump sum of \$165,000 is for both the right of way and construction and equipment, and we are leaving to the discretion of the department the settlement of the bill for right of way. We are not in a position now to estimate it, and they say the whole cost of right of way, equipment, and construction will not exceed \$165,000.

Mr. KING. I suggest an amendment, so that the point I indicated a moment ago may not be raised, by adding, after the word "yards," in line 24, on page 37, the words "not exceeding," so that it will read:

For purchase of right of way and for construction of railroad connection between causeway now crossing Mare Island Straits and the South Vallejo railroad yards, not exceeding \$165,000.

Mr. PAGE. I accept that amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 2, before the words "kilowatt generator," to insert "one hundred."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, line 9, after "\$10,000," to insert "new piers, \$75,000; repairs to east wharf, \$20,000; in all, \$105,000," so as to make the clause read:

Torpedo station, Newport, R. I., buildings: Oil storehouse, \$10,000; new piers, \$75,000; repairs to east wharf, \$20,000; in all, \$105,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, after line 23, to insert:

Marine barracks, Quantico, Va.: Construction of officers' mess building, \$50,000; incinerator plant, \$67,790; in all, \$117,790.

Mr. THOMAS. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Virginia what necessity exists for the construction, after the war is over, of mess buildings, and so forth, at the marine barracks, Quantico?

Mr. SWANSON. That has been made permanent headquarters for the marines.

Mr. THOMAS. It was before, was it not?

Mr. SWANSON. No; it was only during the war that it was put there. The officers' mess building burned down, and this replaces it. You are bound to have an incinerating plant there, but this is to replace, I understand, the officers' mess hall that burned down.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 4, after the word "works," to strike out "\$11,074,350" and insert "\$16,582,140," so as to make the clause read:

Total public works, \$16,582,140, and the amounts herein appropriated therefor, except for repairs and preservation at navy yards and stations, shall be available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 22, after the word "line," to insert "and also a site for a naval hospital in Balboa Park," and on page 41, line 4, after the word "station," to insert "Provided, That should Congress make no provision for construction, or take other action respecting sites for training station or hospital, the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to retransfer the property," so as to make the clause read:

The Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to accept from the San Diego Chamber of Commerce, San Diego, Calif., free of all encumbrance and without cost to the United States Government, 135 acres of land situate on the Bay of San Diego, San Diego County, Calif., for the purpose of establishing a naval training station thereon, providing that the city of San Diego will donate to the United States Government free of charge the tide lands in the Bay of San Diego adjoining said lands to the bulkhead line, and also a site for a naval hospital in Balboa Park. The Secretary of the Navy is directed to have prepared and submit detailed plans and specifications for the construction of a suitable naval training station on said land and to report at the next regular session of Congress the total estimated cost of said station with an itemized cost of all necessary buildings and improvements thereon and the estimated annual cost of maintenance of said station: *Provided*, That should Congress make no provision for construction, or take other action respecting sites for training station or hospital, the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to retransfer the property.



Mr. KING. Before the amendment is agreed to I should like to ask the chairman of the committee whether the plan is to establish another naval hospital?

Mr. PAGE. The plan is to make an investigation, and it has been prompted by the fact that a large gift of land has been made at or near San Diego. The investigation will determine whether we will or will not make a further investment at that point.

Mr. THOMAS. Let me say to the Senator from Utah, if the Senator from Vermont will permit me, that I was in the city of San Diego last April and visited the proposed site for a naval hospital in Balboa Park. I do not believe it can be excelled for location anywhere in the United States. The climate is about as nearly perfect all the year round as can be found anywhere in our country. I know nothing about the expediency or necessity of constructing another naval hospital, but I am sure that the tender of this gift by the city of San Diego to the Navy Department should be accepted by all means.

San Diego is the southernmost city of California and is located upon the only natural harbor in Southern California. It is one of the most magnificent harbors on the Pacific coast.

The naval activities have very naturally and very properly been enlarged since our entry into the Great War. It is the nearest port to South and Central America on the Pacific coast, and there are a naval station there of considerable dimensions, a large aviation station, and a training camp. All those things will require a hospital of some dimensions sooner or later unless the Government should unfortunately abandon its activities in that part of the State.

I am very glad to be able to offer my personal testimony to the admirable location of this proposed gift and to the need, in my judgment, of the Government acting upon it before the offer may be withdrawn. Indeed, I may say without in the slightest degree reflecting or intending to reflect upon any other port or city upon the Pacific coast, San Diego is ideal for a naval hospital, for naval construction, for naval training, and for a naval base.

Mr. PAGE. I wish to add just one word to what the Senator from Colorado has said. It is the present idea that we will soon divide our Navy into two fleets, and that the necessity for additional naval facilities at some point on the Pacific seems to be very great. I have heard no discussion during the consideration of this bill that did not seem to suggest that the selection of San Diego, with the great benefits offered, is desirable.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] will not press his objection. If he will examine the entire paragraph he will see between line 13, on page 40, and line 8, on page 41, the tender of this land is in the nature of an acceptance by the Government of an option. The Secretary intends personally to visit the Pacific coast this summer with the Pacific fleet, and his object is to study the conditions there, which will warrant him, possibly, in making recommendations to the Congress. The Helm report of Navy engineers has not been acted upon by either the department or this body, and it made recommendations for stations along the coast, including San Diego.

It is necessary to have a hospital at San Diego, the most salubrious point on the coast. The citizens there tendered, out of their public park, by this provision which the Secretary is authorized to accept, a valuable site without consideration. The paragraph provides that should the Government not ultimately build a hospital the property may be returned to the citizens. The same is true of the training station. It is a mere tender on the part of the citizens.

That land is worth on the Bay of San Diego probably \$250,000 and has to be acquired from private parties by the citizens in order to make this tender. Then by the provisions of the bill the Secretary is authorized to accept it, and in case Congress does not construct a training station there, then the Secretary is authorized to retransfer it. So I would construe the paragraph merely as giving an option to the Government and obligating it to nothing.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, after line 8, to insert:

The Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to exchange a tract of land, containing 1.29 acres, being a part of the Marine Corps base reservation, San Diego, Calif., and bordering on the northerly line of said reservation approximately 1,500 feet from the extreme northeasterly angle thereof for so much of lot 320 shown on the plan of the city of San Diego, Calif., as lies between the Point Loma Boulevard and the property of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Supplies and Accounts," on page 44, line 15, after the words "per annum," to strike out "\$35,863,989" and insert "\$37,402,959";

in line 20, after the word "constructors," to strike out "\$1,946,272" and insert "\$5,663,808"; on page 45, line 13, after the words "Hospital Corps," to strike out "\$87,507,405"; in line 21, after the word "Force," to strike out "\$15,371,176" and insert "\$17,214,776"; and in line 23, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$163,274,110" and insert "\$175,842,701," so as to make the clause read:

*Pay of the Navy:* Pay and allowances prescribed by law of officers on sea duty and other duty, and officers on waiting orders, and the pay of midshipmen shall hereafter be \$780 per annum, \$37,402,959; officers on the retired list, \$3,442,918; commutation of quarters for officers, including boatswains, gunners, carpenters, sailmakers, machinists, pharmacists, pay clerks, and mates, naval constructor, and assistant naval constructors, \$5,663,808, and also members of Nurse Corps (female), \$44,200; for hire of quarters for officers serving with troops where there are no public quarters belonging to the Government, and where there are not sufficient quarters possessed by the United States to accommodate them or commutation of quarters not to exceed the amount which an officer would receive were he not serving with troops and hire of quarters for officers and enlisted men on sea duty at such times as they may be deprived of their quarters on board ship due to repairs or other conditions which may render them uninhabitable, \$25,000; pay of enlisted men on the retired list, \$585,000; extra pay to men reenlisting under honorable discharge, \$525,570; interest on deposit by men, \$30,000; pay of petty officers, seamen, landsmen, and apprentice seamen, including men in the engineers' force and men detailed for duty with the Fish Commission, enlisted men, men in trade schools; and pay of enlisted men of the Hospital Corps, \$93,075,890; pay of enlisted men undergoing sentence of court-martial, \$1,836,000, and as many machinists as the President may from time to time deem necessary to appoint; and apprentice seamen under training at training stations and on board training ships, at the pay prescribed by law, \$4,694,400; pay of the Nurse Corps, \$1,392,600; rent of quarters for members of the Nurse Corps, \$35,800; retainer pay and active-service pay of members of the Naval Reserve Force, \$17,214,776; payment of \$60 discharge gratuity, \$9,953,780; in all, \$175,842,701; and the money herein specifically appropriated for "Pay of the Navy" shall be disbursed and accounted for in accordance with existing law as "Pay of the Navy," and for that purpose shall constitute one fund: *Provided*, That hereafter the Pay Corps shall be called the Supply Corps.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, after line 3, to insert:

That the provisions of the act of August 29, 1916, regarding the promotion of captains in the line of the Navy shall not restrict the promotion of such captains as may have been wounded in line of duty and are retained on the active list for shore duty under provisions of section 1494, Revised Statutes of the United States, and shall not deprive them of the benefits of the act of March 4, 1911.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item of appropriation for provisions for the Navy, etc., on page 47, line 17, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$42,664,500" and insert "\$45,798,300," so as to read:

*Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to commute rations for such general courts-martial prisoners in such amounts as seem to him proper, which may vary in accordance with the location of the naval prison, but which shall in no case exceed 30 cents per diem for each ration so commuted; and for the purchase of United States Army emergency rations as required; in all, \$45,798,300, to be available until the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item of appropriation for maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, on page 48, line 24, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$4,700,000" and insert "\$5,700,000"; and in line 25, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$13,571,200" and insert "\$15,701,600," so as to read:

*Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, for chemists and for clerical, inspection, storemen, store laborer, and messenger service in the supply and accounting departments of the navy yards and naval stations and disbursing offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, shall not exceed \$5,700,000; in all, \$15,701,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, line 7, after the words "Naval Establishment," to insert "except the naval hospital," so as to make the clause read:

Hereafter the provisions of the sundry civil act, approved July 1, 1918, providing for the establishment of a Government fuel yard in the District of Columbia shall not apply to the fuel required for the Naval Establishment, except the naval hospital, in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Steam Engineering," in the item of appropriation for engineering, on page 53, line 15, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$2,500,000" and insert "\$3,000,000"; and in line 18, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$30,000" and insert "\$32,500," so as to read:

*Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, for clerical, drafting, inspection, and messenger service in navy yards, naval stations, and offices of United States inspectors of machinery and engineering material for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, shall not exceed \$3,000,000: *Provided further*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation for the purchase of land for a site for a radio shore station at Otter Cliffs, Me., shall not exceed \$32,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, in line 22, after the word "messages," to insert:

*Provided further,* That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to cause to be prepared in the Office of Communications, Navy Department, a publication known as the Shipping Bulletin, and to publish and furnish the same to the maritime interests of the United States and other interested parties at the cost of collecting and publishing the information, including the cost of printing and paper and other necessary expenses, the money received from the sale of such publication to be returned by the Secretary of the Navy into the Treasury of the United States, to be used in the future preparation of the publication referred to, publication of which is authorized until such time as the publication may be self-supporting. Twenty thousand dollars of this appropriation, or so much thereof as may be necessary, may be applied to the purposes hereof.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the Senator having the bill in charge to the item which has been read, the amendment beginning on page 53, line 22, down to and including line 11, on page 54. I desire to say that that amendment has reference to the future publication by the Navy Department of the daily Shipping Bulletin. I hold in my hand a copy of the bulletin. Under existing law the Joint Committee on Printing has full authority to authorize the publication of this document. In the hearings I notice that the department asks for a year's continuation of its publication. There is no question that the Joint Committee on Printing, if the publication of this bulletin is found advisable and the Secretary requests its publication for another year, will grant the request.

I desire to say, however, in passing, that it is partly a duplication of work. This information is already collected in part by the Commerce Department. It is information furnished by them; but if it is desired to continue the publication for another year I have no objection to that, although at present I do not believe it is necessary. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask that the committee amendment be disagreed to.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, it is expected that this publication will be self-sustaining. There is a great demand in every part of the United States for this publication relative to shipping, so that everyone who desires may have copies of it. I do not know in what respect it furnishes duplicated information. This information has been furnished; and I repeat there is a great demand for it all over the world by commercial people. They get the radio news, which is published every day, as to ships in nearly every large port of the world. News of the arrival of ships and other similar information is published in this bulletin. The entire commerce of this country, which is larger than that of any other country in the world, is greatly accommodated by this publication. I do not know what the program of the Senator from Utah is.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to say to the Senator from Virginia that this information in part is furnished by the Commerce Department, and it is by that department that it should be furnished. It is relative to the commerce of the world, and that subject should be handled by the Department of Commerce.

What we are trying to do is to stop all duplication in printing, if possible. If the Senator will look at the hearings, he will find that all that is asked is the continuation of the printing of this document for one year.

Mr. THOMAS. Does the Senator from Utah say that the publication of this bulletin would be a duplication of information?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; it is a duplication of information. Not only that, but all the Navy Department will have to do is to show the Joint Committee on Printing that this publication is absolutely necessary and there will not be a question about the matter. The Senator from Colorado will remember, however, that in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, which was passed at the last session of Congress, there was a provision inserted authorizing the Joint Committee on Printing to abolish the issue of all unnecessary public magazines and publications of the Government. If the Senator from Colorado will take the time with me and go down to the room of the Joint Committee on Printing right at this moment, I will show him the vast amount of printing that is being done by the different departments of this Government, or, rather, the printing which has been done in the past. There has been duplication after duplication, costing hundreds of thousands of dollars for paper, in addition to the cost of the printing. That will be discontinued, and yet we have received hardly a protest against such discontinuance. The provision to which I have referred was passed in order to stop duplication and unnecessary work. It is for that reason I ask that this provision be disagreed to. If the Secretary of the Navy will come, as is provided by law, and show to the Joint Committee on Printing that this is a necessary publication, I will assure the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] that there will not be a single member of the committee who will object to its being printed.

Mr. SWANSON. As I understand, all they desired was that the publication be continued for one year. The information

which the commercial interests obtain from this bulletin is information they can get from no other source. This bulletin receives the radio news from all parts of the world.

Mr. SMOOT. They claim to have information as to the movement of all the ships in the world.

Mr. SWANSON. They have been furnishing this news; they have been paid for it; and they ask that the publication be continued for one year. It is for the shipping interests. So far as the Navy and naval activities are concerned it does not help them at all. It is for the commercial interests. As a naval proposition it is not needed, but the Navy has access to it.

The information is furnished and charged for, and as I have said is great accommodation to the entire commercial interests; but, I repeat, so far as the Navy is concerned, it does not affect the Navy at all. So far as my information goes, I think, if this publication be eliminated, the shipping and commercial interests would be deprived of something which they are desirous of having. The amendment, however, is subject to a point of order.

Mr. SMOOT. I know that, but I do not want to make the point of order. I simply say to the Senator from Virginia that the publication is unnecessary. I do not desire to make the point of order; but if the amendment is not to be withdrawn, I shall make the point of order.

Mr. THOMAS. From what the Senator from Utah says I think the point of order should be made against the amendment. His committee is engaged in the very laudable task, not only of eliminating duplications but of saving money. It would be poor encouragement to that committee, upon the other hand, if we increase our duplications.

Mr. SMOOT. I will make the point of order.

Mr. THOMAS. I will make the point of order in a moment, and shall be glad to do so. I do not perceive the consistency of the publication of such a bulletin by the Navy Department. This bulletin has reference to commerce, and very properly falls under the jurisdiction of the Department of Commerce. If the department has not the facilities for obtaining radio intelligence, then it should take steps to obtain it at once. I make the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, just a word before the point of order is ruled on. I desire to say to the Senate at this time that a few years ago the paper bill of the Government amounted to \$917,000. Since then it has increased, until last year it amounted to nearly \$5,000,000. I undertook to ascertain the cause of this increase. It was not occasioned by the price of paper, which during all the time had not advanced very much in price. So I began an investigation. I myself found 47 publicity bureaus in the departments. I thought I would ascertain how widely publicity publications were being sent out through the mail. I wrote to a friend of mine out in Kansas, living in a little town of about 20,000, requesting him to keep for me, beginning with the following Monday morning, for six days the number of circulars sent under franked envelopes from the different departments of the Government, and to send them back to me at Washington. I want to tell the Senate what the result was. Beginning on Monday of that week until Saturday night there were sent to this one man 106 circulars; and out of the 106 circulars 11 of them were duplicates and issued by different departments of the Government; there were four duplications in another case and three in another case out of 106 such circulars. That was only for one week. I did not make the test in New York or in Chicago; but I took a little city, away out in Kansas, and I took an ordinary business man, and I found that 106 circulars were sent to that one business man in one week. That is why the Government's paper bill went from \$917,000 to nearly \$5,000,000.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. And the publications were of no value.

Mr. SMOOT. And I desire to say that if the Joint Committee on Printing can stop this practice, it is going to stop it. It is for this reason that I offered the amendment to the legislative bill in the closing hours of the last session of Congress; and I say to the Senate that we are not going to save merely \$100,000, but we are going to save to this Government millions of dollars if the Senate of the United States will stand by its committee.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. On the Army appropriation bill, page 72, there was a provision to continue certain Army publications, and the Senate did not hesitate a moment, on the statement of the chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, to eliminate that provision. I hold in my hand the law which we passed. I merely want to put it in the Record. Congress passed a law, and, as chairman of the committee at that time,



I gave notice to all those having charge of these various publications of the proposed action of the committee on the further continuance of such publications. In that notice I called attention to section 11 of public act No. 314, Sixty-fifth Congress, approved March 1, 1919, which provides:

*Provided further,* That on and after July 1, 1919, all printing, binding, and blank-book work for Congress, the Executive Office, the judiciary, and every executive department, independent office, and establishment of the Government shall be done at the Government Printing Office, except such classes of work as shall be deemed by the Joint Committee on Printing to be urgent or necessary to have done elsewhere than in the District of Columbia for the exclusive use of any field service outside of said District.

Under the provision to which the Senator from Utah has referred we have already saved hundreds of thousands of dollars, and, as he suggests, if we will stand by the committee in this matter, we will save a good many hundreds of thousands of dollars more—yea, I believe millions.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, after hearing what the Senator from Utah has said, I wish to read exactly what the situation of this matter is. I hope the Senator will save millions of dollars, but in saving millions of dollars I hope he will not hurt the best interests of the country. This is only an appropriation of \$20,000 to provide for the publication of this bulletin, which will be sold to the public. If the Senator makes a point of order, that is all right, but I wish to state how the publication of this bulletin grew up in the Navy Department. Here is what the Secretary of the Navy says about it:

Secretary DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, on page 775 of the hearings in the House committee you will find a statement by Admiral Bullard, in charge of the naval communication service. Early in the war there was no way to find out anything about the movements of ships, and the Navy Department began with a little daily bulletin, typewritten and manifolded, and then it grew into a bulletin, and quite a large bulletin, giving this information, and we show, for instance, the location of 11,000 merchant vessels, where they were at any and all times.

The CHAIRMAN. How often was that published?

Secretary DANIELS. Every day. It showed to all the shipping world the movement of ships. We have had letters from, I might say, all the shipping interests, the Associated Press, United Press, and International Service, all the mediums of publicity, asking that we should continue to publish that bulletin. Of course, we published it during the war and distributed it free at quite an expense. In time of peace it probably would be right that this publication should be paid for by those who desire it, and the House introduced into their bill an appropriation of \$20,000 to put the bulletin on its feet, and the authorization that we should publish it and charge for it, and this \$20,000 was to help us along until it would be self-supporting. Of course, being new legislation and subject to a point of order, it went out in the House on a point of order. It was unanimously reported by the House committee that it was a very important service, and that we ought to at least keep it up for a year longer, and I would suggest that this committee insert the same provision that the House committee inserted. It is a very great and important service, and unless we render it I do not know how it will be rendered in the next year.

The CHAIRMAN. You think it will lead to no other appropriation than \$20,000?

Secretary DANIELS. No; Admiral Bullard, who has looked into the matter very thoroughly, says that if he has \$20,000 he can get it on its feet and then it will be a matter of sale. Of course, after the next year it may come to be a private enterprise, when we may get out from it altogether, but I think that having begun it and carried it on for two years so well, and having the facilities, the wireless and all the apparatus to do it—and nobody else has those facilities—it would be a very wise thing to do.

Senator PITTMAN. Is not such information of very great value to the Navy?

Secretary DANIELS. It is of the greatest importance to the Navy as well as to the shipping world. You see, this information has never been published before, I think, by any nation. Lloyds furnish it in Great Britain and we were more or less dependent on that, and now they are exchanging information with this bulletin. So we are enabled to put in it all that the Navy and the naval forces can secure and exchange information with the service across the sea. It is of very good value to the Navy, and is of very great value to the shipping world. I have had a number of letters from press associations and shipping agencies as to its vital importance. I think that it can be put on distribution if that amount is allowed.

The only purpose of this appropriation is to continue the distribution of this information. If the appropriation is not made, the publication will cease; but I submit that it ought to be continued, as the shipping world is now desirous of securing it, although I do not believe there should be any duplication. I admit, however, that the amendment is subject to a point of order.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I make the point of order because of my reliance on the statement of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], which I do not doubt for a moment. On any question of this kind I think the unqualified statement of the Senator from Utah can be relied upon absolutely. From that statement it appears that this information is being furnished by another department. That department can function with regard to every object sought to be accomplished by this publication that the Navy Department can. If the Navy needs it, it can be transmitted there by the Department of Commerce. But the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] says the Navy is the department receiving the information. That being so, it has the information necessary for naval purposes, and it can

easily and readily be transmitted to the Department of Commerce for commercial purposes. Certainly the practice of needless duplication is not businesslike, is not proper, and can not be defended. For that reason I insist upon the point of order.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, if I may ask the Senator from Utah a question, does the Department of Commerce issue a bulletin that serves the same purpose as the one provided for in this item?

Mr. SMOOT. The Department of Commerce up to the present time does not issue a bulletin perhaps as comprehensive as this, but this was gotten out at the time of the war. As I said in the beginning, if it is absolutely necessary that this bulletin be published for a year longer, all that Mr. Daniels has to do is to come to the Joint Committee on Printing and get authority under the law for continuing the publication. But we do not want to begin—

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. So that it can be printed, even if we do not authorize it in this bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly. That is what I said in the first place; and not only that but I wish to say to the Senator from Virginia—and the Senate ought to know this—that when Secretary Daniels was asked what it cost per day for the cablegrams from all over the world—

Mr. THOMAS. Radiograms, I presume.

Mr. SMOOT. I presume the information was received by radio—he said the cost of getting this information from all over the world, while he could not give an exact estimate, the best estimate that was given was \$1,000 a day. That was the best estimate that could be even thought of. All I want to ask the Senate is, after giving authority to the Joint Committee on Printing to determine whether or not these magazines or bulletins should be published, not now to begin to tear that authority down in every bill that comes into this body. I assure the Senator from Virginia and also the Senator from Vermont that if the Secretary of the Navy can show to the committee that it is necessary to continue the publication of this bulletin the committee will grant that privilege for another year as requested.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Who defrays the expense of that \$1,000 a day for this information?

Mr. SMOOT. It is paid out of a lump-sum appropriation, I will say to the Senator, and nobody knows the exact amount, and we never will know. That is the curse of these lump-sum appropriations.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, the Senator is mistaken about this appropriation. It is simply an allowance of \$20,000 out of the appropriation made, to be used to continue this bulletin, and it is expected that the public will pay for it. Secretary Daniels says that \$20,000 is necessary to continue the publication of this bulletin, but expects it to be self-sustaining.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I was not referring to that; I was referring to the statement made by the Senator from Utah that it was costing \$1,000 per day to get the information which they only ask \$20,000 to disseminate.

Mr. SMOOT. The \$20,000 is for the printing of the publication, not for gathering the information.

Mr. SWANSON. According to the hearings, Secretary Daniels said he did not know what the actual cost of gathering the information was, but the department was getting radios every day from 11,000 ships, which information was put in the form of a bulletin, so that the shipping interests could know where the different ships were located each day. As to the exact cost of that he said he did not know, but he expected to include that cost, the cost of printing and the cost of distribution, and make those who wanted the information pay for it.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. What I want to know is, who defrays the expense of these radiograms and cablegrams that are printed in this bulletin?

Mr. SMOOT. I told the Senator who defrayed that expense. We grant a lump-sum appropriation, and the expense is paid out of that lump-sum appropriation. If the statement of the Senator from Virginia is correct that there are 11,000 of those daily reports by radio, the estimate of \$1,000 a day is much too small.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator, as usual, did not get a clear statement of what I said. I did not say that 11,000 radiograms were received every day. I said that information as to 11,000 ships was received every day. In one harbor there might be 100 ships located, and one radio could give the number of ships located there. This bulletin gives the location on each day, as I have said, of 11,000 ships, but I did not say that the department received 11,000 radio reports.

Mr. SMOOT. The name of the ship has to be given daily and its location; but, of course, if there are 100 ships located at one

time in one harbor, the location could be given for the 100 ships in one radio.

Mr. SWANSON. The Navy Department wishes to continue this service, which the country wants; but if the Senate thinks best to discontinue it, I assume it will be discontinued.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I should like to know what the parliamentary status of the pending question is? I understood the Senator from Colorado made a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. I withheld the point of order in order to enable Senators who wanted to speak upon the subject to do so. I now renew it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is sustained.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was, on page 55, line 4, after the word "necessary," to insert "for this purpose," so as to make the clause read:

So much of the naval appropriations for the fiscal year 1920 as is necessary for this purpose may be transferred on the books of the Treasury to the credit of the regular appropriations of the Coast Guard and Lighthouse Services.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Naval Academy," on page 56, line 16, after the word "coppersmiths," to insert "who shall be considered practical instructors of midshipmen," so as to make the clause read:

Department of marine engineering and naval construction: For master machinists, assistants, pattern makers, boiler makers, blacksmiths, machinists, molders, coppersmiths, who shall be considered practical instructors of midshipmen, and other employees, \$52,694.16.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Marine Corps," on page 61, line 13, after the date "1920," to insert "so far as practicable," so as to make the clause read:

The authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Marine Corps is hereby temporarily increased to 27,400, plus such number of men as may be serving with the American Expeditionary Forces abroad: *Provided*, That the average number of enlisted men of the Marine Corps on active duty during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, so far as practicable shall not exceed 27,400, distribution in the various grades to be made in the same proportion as provided under existing law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, after line 16, to insert:

That in making reductions required by this act, officers holding temporary appointments may be given temporary appointments in lower grades, and officers so appointed shall take precedence from the dates of their original appointments in such lower grades: *Provided*, That 25 additional marine gunners and 25 additional quartermaster clerks are hereby authorized.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, after line 23, to insert:

That so much of the act of July 1, 1919 (Public, No. 182), as authorizes the promotion of retired enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps ordered to active duty shall not be so construed as to make illegal promotions of such men as have heretofore been made to warrant grades or as to deprive them of any of the pay, allowances, or other benefits accruing under such promotion.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 63, after line 14, to strike out:

In the office of the paymaster: One chief clerk, at \$2,250; one clerk, at \$1,500.

And insert:

That in the office of the paymaster, Marine Corps, Washington, D. C., and in such subordinate offices of the paymaster's department as the Secretary of the Navy may direct, a pay clerk may be detailed as chief pay clerk: *Provided*, That chief pay clerks so detailed shall receive the pay and allowances and other benefits of the next higher grade.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 64, line 11, after the word "force," to strike out "\$45,711.28" and insert "\$41,961.28," so as to make the clause read:

In all, for pay of civil force, \$41,961.28, and the money herein specifically appropriated for pay of the Marine Corps shall be disbursed and accounted for in accordance with existing law as pay of the Marine Corps, and for that purpose shall constitute one fund.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 64, line 16, after the words "Marine Corps," to strike out "\$19,320,560" and insert "\$19,316,810.28," so as to make the clause read:

In all, pay, Marine Corps, \$19,316,810.28.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Maintenance, Quartermaster's Department, Marine Corps," on page 67, line 7, after the word "buildings," to strike out "in the District of Columbia, and at such other places as the public exigencies require," and insert "and the erection of temporary buildings after the approval of the Secretary of the Navy; such buildings not to exceed a total cost of \$5,000 during the year," so as to make the clause read:

Repairs of barracks, Marine Corps: Repairs and improvements to barracks, quarters, and other public buildings at posts and stations; for the renting, leasing, and improvement of buildings and the erection of temporary buildings after the approval of the Secretary of the Navy; such buildings not to exceed a total cost of \$5,000 during the year, \$660,898.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, as an amendment to the committee amendment, after the word "buildings," on page 67, in line 7, I move to insert "in the District of Columbia, and at such other places as the public exigencies require, and outside of the District of Columbia for the erection of temporary buildings, with the approval of the Secretary of the Navy." I offer this amendment at the request of the quartermaster of the Marine Corps.

Mr. THOMAS. I should like a little information upon the committee amendment itself. This phraseology is somewhat unusual, "and the erection of temporary buildings after the approval of the Secretary of the Navy; such buildings not to exceed a total cost of \$5,000 during the year, \$660,898."

Does that mean that from the general appropriation for repairs of barracks for the Marine Corps a maximum of \$5,000 may be expended for the erection of temporary buildings?

Mr. PAGE. I believe that it has been found necessary to erect a few temporary buildings for the benefit of the Marine Corps in the field. That, I think, applies to such places as Santo Domingo and Haiti.

Mr. THOMAS. This does not increase the House appropriation, but makes a special appropriation of \$5,000 from that sum. That is the effect of it, is it not?

Mr. PAGE. It makes a limitation of \$5,000. That is the effect of it.

Mr. THOMAS. Very well.

Mr. PAGE. In so far as I may do so, I accept the amendment of the Senator from Maine.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Maine to the amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 67, line 7, after the word "buildings," it is proposed to strike out the remainder of line 7 and down to and including the word "year," in line 11, and insert:

In the District of Columbia, and at such other places as the public exigencies require, and outside of the District of Columbia for the erection of temporary buildings with the approval of the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I should like to inquire if the Senator designs to leave out the limitation of \$5,000 in line 11?

Mr. HALE. Yes. The department ask to leave out the limitation of \$5,000, because they can not tell how much they will need and they do not think that any limitation is necessary.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Mr. President, the department do not think that any limitation is necessary.

Mr. HALE. Very little is used for this purpose.

Mr. MCCORMICK. They never do think that a limitation is necessary.

Mr. HALE. There is a limit, of course, anyway.

Mr. MCCORMICK. The Senator means the aggregate limit?

Mr. HALE. Yes. But they stated that \$5,000 would not in any event cover what they ordinarily use in the course of the year.

Mr. MCCORMICK. They suggest a limit, then?

Mr. HALE. I should like to read a letter which I have regarding this matter from Gen. McCawley, the quartermaster of the Marine Corps. The letter is as follows:

HEADQUARTERS UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS,  
OFFICE OF THE QUARTERMASTER,  
Washington, D. C., June 25, 1919.

MY DEAR SENATOR HALE: I have just received a copy of the naval appropriation bill reported by the Senate, and note with great regret the change made in the appropriation "Repairs of barracks, Marine Corps," on page 67, which defeats entirely the object intended, as you will note that this prevents the renting, leasing, and improvement of buildings in the District of Columbia, and also limits the cost of the erection of temporary buildings to \$5,000 when built at places outside of the District.

I would infinitely prefer to have the House wording remain rather than this Senate amendment, as practically nothing can be done with \$5,000 toward the erection of a building, and I certainly wish to retain the authority of law for renting, leasing, and improving buildings, not only in the District of Columbia but elsewhere, where the public exigencies require.

There seems to have been an unfortunate misconception in regard to the wording of this appropriation which has remained in the law for the last 20 years and about which there has been no abuse. As you know, there is a general law which prohibits the rental of buildings in the District of Columbia without the specific sanction of Congress, and as there is no time to obtain such specific sanction now the Marine Corps would be obliged to vacate several buildings which are now under lease in the District of Columbia.

So you will see that a very serious situation presents itself unless the wording of this act is changed. Won't you please therefore either have the wording changed as you proposed in the hearings the other day, and authorize the erection of buildings outside of the District of Columbia, and if this can't be done induce the Senate to recede from its amendment to the House bill, as I would rather postpone any further discussion of the matter until next December when the new estimates are



presented than to have the bill go through the way the Senate has amended it.

This is so important that may I ask you to give it your personal attention, or else we must abandon several very important buildings now occupied by us in the District, which would practically throw us on the streets, as they involve a garage, a stable, carpenter shop, and office space.

The following change would be acceptable to us:

Repairs of barracks, Marine Corps: Repairs and improvements to barracks, quarters, and other public buildings at posts and stations; for renting, leasing, and improvement of buildings in the District of Columbia, and at such other places as the public exigencies require, and outside of the District of Columbia for the erection of temporary buildings with the approval of the Secretary of the Navy.

Very sincerely, yours,

C. L. McCawley.

Hon. FREDERICK HALE,  
United States Senate, Washington.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I accepted the amendment of the Senator from Maine; but inasmuch as the limitation of cost is left out I will withdraw my acceptance of the amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, it seems to me that the words "in the District of Columbia, and at such other places as the public exigencies require," should be stricken out of this bill, for if they are allowed to remain in here they authorize the Marine Corps to rent buildings and lease buildings and improve buildings in the District of Columbia. We have just appointed a public-buildings commission to assign space in the Government buildings to the different departments of the Government. This law being passed after the creation of that commission, which law gave them certain powers, it seems to me that it will simply repeal the provision of that law, and, as far as the Marine Corps is concerned, they can go ahead and rent as many buildings in the District of Columbia, within the appropriation, as they see fit, or lease and improve the buildings within the appropriation. That is not what Congress intended, and it does seem to me that the amendment striking out that part of the provision of the law ought to be agreed to.

As to the other part of the amendment I have nothing to say.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I am with the Senator on this commission to assign space. I think striking out "in the District of Columbia, and at such other places as the public exigencies require," was to some extent a clerical error. I will illustrate to the Senator what I mean.

The Marine Corps have some buildings that they have been leasing here. They are bound to have some transitory buildings. The Marine Corps is not a stable body like one of these departments with a lot of clerks, and so on. Sometimes more of the corps are here and sometimes less. They have some leased buildings, and of course under this provision that we have we can assign them to buildings. If they have any money to lease buildings, we can take them out and give them to somebody else; but if that language is put in there they will not have any money to lease buildings, and we will not have any authority to say whether they can have them or not have them. Do I make myself clear to the Senator?

Mr. SMOOT. I have not the surveys here, nor can I remember what assignment we gave to the Marine Corps.

Mr. SWANSON. I do not think that was included, or only to some extent. I do not know why it came out. My idea would be this:

They are bound to lease some buildings here. You do not want them to own all their buildings here, because their force is a temporary one at times. They have a certain number passing through here and staying for a short while and leaving in a year or so. My idea is that a mistake was made in striking out "in the District of Columbia," because we want to prevent erecting these buildings here, and that was intended to apply to the erection of buildings, and we wanted to prohibit it. It seems to me that the commission, of which the Senator from Utah and myself are members, could handle this matter if it read:

For the renting, leasing, and improvement of buildings in the District of Columbia, and the erection of temporary buildings elsewhere.

If they lease any buildings here, any that they lease are subject to the disposal of this commission; but if we do not authorize them to lease some here, and we have no authority or money to lease any, we will have none to assign to them.

Mr. SMOOT. Then, would the Senator object to an amendment so that it would read as follows:

For the renting, leasing, and improvement of buildings in the District of Columbia, by and with the approval of the Public Buildings Commission.

Mr. SWANSON. I think that is all right. I think that is good policy.

Mr. SMOOT. I would have no objection, then.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senators may understand this matter down there, but nobody up here understands anything about it.

Mr. SMOOT. The item, then, would read as follows:

Repairs of barracks, Marine Corps: Repairs and improvements to barracks, quarters, and other public buildings at posts and stations; for the renting, leasing, and improvement of buildings in the District of Columbia, with the approval of the Public Buildings Commission, \$660,898, and the erection of temporary buildings after the approval of the Secretary of the Navy, such buildings not to exceed a total cost of \$5,000.

Mr. HALE. That should be left out.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator want that out?

Mr. HALE. Yes.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I think while this amendment is here it might be well to put that limit at \$10,000. If we send marines to Santo Domingo or Haiti or Panama, this fund is used to erect temporary buildings there. If we gave them unlimited authority, they could erect temporary buildings at Quantico, or they could erect them anywhere. This limit was put there with the purpose of prohibiting them from erecting temporary buildings anywhere except when the force was out in the field. I think \$10,000 will enable them to cover the necessity for any temporary buildings anywhere.

Mr. SMOOT. Then the amendment would be the same as I read down to the word "Navy," with the following—

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, will the Senator read the whole amendment again?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the Secretary state it.

The SECRETARY. Strike out the entire paragraph and insert a new one, to read as follows—

Mr. KING. On what page?

The SECRETARY. Page 67, line 4. Strike out the entire paragraph and insert a new paragraph to read as follows:

Repairs of barracks, Marine Corps: Repairs and improvements to barracks, quarters, and other public buildings at posts and stations; for the renting, leasing, and improvement of buildings in the District of Columbia, with the approval of the Public Buildings Commission, and the erection of temporary buildings after the approval of the Secretary of the Navy, \$660,898.

Mr. McCORMICK. Where is the limitation?

Mr. SMOOT. "Such buildings not to exceed a total cost of \$10,000 during the year."

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, that limits them, then, simply to repairing and improving buildings in the District of Columbia, and they want the right to do it in other places besides the District of Columbia. That part has been entirely left out of the Senator's proposed amendment.

Mr. SWANSON. I wish the Secretary would state the amendment again.

Mr. SMOOT. May I state the way in which the amendment to the proposed amendment would read? After the words "Public Buildings Commission," put in "and at such other places as the public exigencies require," and after the word "Navy," insert "such buildings not to exceed a total cost of \$10,000 during the year." Now I will ask the Secretary to state the amendment as finally framed.

The SECRETARY. Strike out the entire paragraph and insert the following:

Repairs of barracks, Marine Corps: Repairs and improvements to barracks, quarters, and other public buildings at posts and stations; for the renting, leasing, and improvement of buildings in the District of Columbia, with the approval of the Public Buildings Commission, and at such other places as the public exigencies require, and the erection of temporary buildings after the approval of the Secretary of the Navy, such buildings not to exceed a total cost of \$10,000 during the year, \$660,898.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the vote whereby the amendment was agreed to will be reconsidered; the committee amendment is disagreed to, and the amendment now offered is agreed to. The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was, on page 68, line 19, after the word "men," to insert "mess equipment for properly constituted officers' messes," and on page 70, line 7, after the word "paid," to insert:

Provided further, That the provisions of the act of March 3, 1885 (23 Stats., 350), entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of the claims of officers and enlisted men of the Army for loss of private property destroyed in the military service of the United States," as amended by the act of March 4, 1915 (38 Stats., 1077), shall hereafter apply to officers and enlisted men of the Marine Corps under similar conditions, and the amount of such loss so ascertained and determined shall be paid from the appropriation, "Pay, Marine Corps," and the certificate of the major general commandant of the Marine Corps shall be sufficient voucher for, and shall be final as to, all matters necessary to the establishment and payment or settlement of any claim filed hereunder.

So as to read:

Contingent, Marine Corps: For freight, expressage, tolls, cartage, advertising, washing of bed sacks, mattress covers, pillowcases, towels, and sheets, funeral expenses of officers and enlisted men, and retired officers on active duty during the war, and retired enlisted men of the Marine Corps, including the transportation of bodies and their arms

and wearing apparel from the place of demise to the homes of the deceased in the United States; stationery and other paper, printing and binding; telegraphing, rent of telephones; purchase, repair, and exchange of typewriters; apprehension of stragglers and deserters; per diem of enlisted men employed on constant labor for periods of not less than 10 days; employment of civilian labor; purchase, repair, and installation and maintenance of gas, electric, sewer, and water pipes and fixtures; office and barracks furniture, vacuum cleaners, camp and garrison equipage and implements; mess utensils for enlisted men; mess equipment for properly constituted officers' messes; packing boxes, wrapping paper, oilcloth, crash, rope, twine, quarantine fees, camphor and carbonized paper, carpenters' tools, tools for police purposes, safes, purchase, hire, repair, and maintenance of such harness, wagons, motor wagons, armored automobiles, carts, drays, motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles, to be used only for official purposes, and other vehicles as are required for the transportation of troops and supplies and for official military and garrison purposes; purchase of public horses and mules; services of veterinary surgeons, and medicines for public animals, and the authorized number of officers' horses; purchase of mounts and horse equipment for all officers below the grade of major required to be mounted; shoeing for public animals and the authorized number of officers' horses; purchase and repair of hose, fire extinguishers, hand grenades, carts, wheelbarrows, and lawn mowers, purchase, installation, and repair of cooking and heating stoves and furnaces; purchase of towels, soap, combs, and brushes for offices; postage stamps for foreign and registered postage; books, newspapers, and periodicals; improving parade grounds; repairs of pumps and wharves, water; straw for bedding, mattresses; mattress covers, pillows, sheets, furniture for Government quarters and repair of same; packing and crating officers' allowance of baggage on change of station; deodorizing, lubricants, disinfectants; for the construction, operation, and maintenance of laundries; and for all emergencies and extraordinary expenses arising at home and abroad, but impossible to anticipate or classify, \$2,740,322: *Provided*, That hereafter the funds received in payment for laundry work performed by post laundries shall be used to defray the cost of operation of said laundries and the receipts and expenditures shall be accounted for in accordance with the methods prescribed by law and any sums remaining at the end of the fiscal year after such cost of maintenance and operation have been defrayed shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the appropriation from which the cost of operation of such plants is paid: *Provided further*, That the provisions of the act of March 3, 1885 (23 Stat., 350), entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of the claims of officers and enlisted men of the Army for loss of private property destroyed in the military service of the United States," as amended by the act of March 4, 1915 (38 Stat., 1077), shall hereafter apply to officers and enlisted men of the Marine Corps under similar conditions, and the amount of such loss so ascertained and determined shall be paid from the appropriation, "Pay, Marine Corps," and the certificate of the major general commandant of the Marine Corps shall be sufficient voucher for, and shall be final as to, all matters necessary to the establishment and payment or settlement of any claim filed hereunder.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I should like to submit and ask the attention of the chairman of the committee to an amendment to this amendment. This amendment is intended to extend to the Marine Corps the benefits which now are enjoyed by the Army in compensation for baggage lost in the military service; and I offer an amendment to extend the provisions so as to include the Navy.

I move to insert, on line 14, after the words "of the," the words "Navy and"; on line 16, change the word "appropriation" to "appropriations"; before the words "Pay, Marine Corps," insert "Pay of the Navy and"; on line 16, after the words "Pay, Marine Corps," insert "respectively"; change the word "certificate" to "certificates"; on line 17, before the words "major general commandant," insert "Secretary of the Navy and"; on line 17, after the words "Marine Corps," insert "respectively"; and on line 18 change the word "voucher" to "vouchers."

The effect of these several changes will be to extend the benefits of this provision for the recovery of baggage lost in the military service to the Navy as well as to the Army and the Marine Corps.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I understand that the only effect of this amendment is to place the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps on a parity. I believe the amendment is a good one, and so far as I am able to do so I am glad to accept it.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I should like to say that of course the conditions are a little different as to losses on naval ships in marine service. There ought to be some limitation that will give relief to naval officers on account of conditions due to the war. I think this matter ought to go to conference, but some little changes may be necessary in order to make it applicable to the Navy. The Marine Corps serves under conditions similar to those of the Army; and I should like to have the Senator, who probably will be on the conference committee, look at that phase of it and see to what extent modifications should be made on account of the difference in the two services.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think these two amendments cover the entire proposition as suggested by the Senator from Virginia, but I shall be glad to look into it further. It covers private property destroyed in the military service of the United States. That covers all contingencies in the military service.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? Is there not some legislation now to provide relief for those engaged in the naval service for losses that occur under the circumstances which this amendment seeks to cover?

Mr. POINDEXTER. No. Heretofore the only legislation on the subject has applied to the Army. The Senate committee adopted an amendment extending those provisions to the Marine Corps. Through inattention the Navy was not considered in that connection. I offer this amendment simply to extend to the Navy the provisions of that act, which heretofore has been exclusively for the benefit of the Army.

Mr. KING. Not remembering the terms of the act, does the Senator think its provisions would be applicable to the Navy? I can easily conceive of circumstances under which losses might result in the Army which would be so different from those which might obtain in the Navy that the statute with respect to providing for losses in the Army ought not to apply and could not be applied. It occurs to me that this is a subject which would require independent legislation.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, we have given relief in this war to marine officers. We have given it to Army officers. Under certain conditions, sometimes on land, naval officers are similarly situated. Now we put in there "the Navy," and it puts it in the same position, so that relief can come to all three services at the same time. It seems to me that is right; but I simply suggest to the Senator that I think, as the Senator from Utah has said, that there will have to be a different provision for each. However, this puts it in conference, so that the proper relief can be given to all three of the branches at the same time.

Mr. KING. I am not disposed to raise the point of order, because I feel that in justice those in the Navy ought to receive relief the same as those in the Army and in the Marine Corps; but I do suggest that a statute that gives relief to the Army might be wholly incongruous when you sought to apply it to losses sustained in the Navy, since the conditions are so different as to the personnel in each.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, in that connection I ask leave to have printed in the RECORD the act of March 3, 1885, referred to in this amendment, in order that the entire record may be available.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The matter referred to is as follows:

Chap. 335. An act to provide for the settlement of the claims of officers and enlisted men of the Army for loss of private property destroyed in the military service of the United States.

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the proper accounting officers of the Treasury be, and they are hereby, authorized and directed to examine into, ascertain, and determine the value of the private property belonging to officers and enlisted men in the military service of the United States which has been, or may hereafter be, lost or destroyed in the military service under the following circumstances:

First. When such loss or destruction was without fault or negligence on the part of the claimant.

Second. Where the private property so lost or destroyed was shipped on board an unseaworthy vessel by order of any officer authorized to give such order or direct such shipment.

Third. Where it appears that the loss or destruction of the private property of the claimant was in consequence of his having given his attention to the saving of the property belonging to the United States which was in danger at the same time and under similar circumstances. And the amount of such loss so ascertained and determined shall be paid out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and shall be in full for all such loss or damage: *Provided*, That any claim which shall be presented and acted on under authority of this act shall be held as finally determined, and shall never thereafter be reopened or considered: *And provided further*, That this act shall not apply to losses sustained in time of war or hostilities with Indians: *And provided further*, That the liability of the Government under this act shall be limited to such articles of personal property as the Secretary of War, in his discretion, shall decide to be reasonable, useful, necessary, and proper for such officer or soldier while in quarters engaged in the public service in the line of duty: *And provided further*, That all claims now existing shall be presented within two years and not after from the passage of this act, and all such claims hereafter arising be presented within two years from the occurrence of the loss or destruction.

Approved, March 3, 1885.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was, on page 71, line 4, after the word "works," to strike out "\$42,749,888.28" and insert "\$42,746,138.28", so as to make the clause read:

Total, Marine Corps, exclusive of public works, \$42,746,138.28.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Naval Emergency Fund," on page 73, after line 17, to insert:

The Secretary of the Navy is hereby directed to investigate and, at the beginning of the next regular session of Congress, to report to Congress the facts and circumstances relating to losses or delay caused to contractors and subcontractors in the performance of work or supplying of materials or construction, upon fixed price contracts, for or with the Navy Department, where such losses or delay were caused by increases in the cost of materials, labor, or transportation charges, or



by embargoes, or restraints upon trade, brought about by the action of Government agencies, after the date upon which such contracts were entered into; and to make recommendations to Congress for an equitable adjustment of compensation or waiver of damages in each of such cases.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 74, after line 5, to strike out:

That no part of the moneys appropriated in each or any section of this act shall be used or expended for the purchase or acquirement of any article or articles that, at the time of the proposed acquirement, can be manufactured or produced in the United States for a sum less than they can be purchased or acquired elsewhere.

And insert:

That except for emergency requirements no part of the moneys appropriated in each or any section of this act shall be used or expended for the purchase or acquirement in any foreign country of any article or articles or materials that, at the time of the proposed acquirement, can be manufactured or produced at reasonable prices in the United States unless the efficient operation of the Navy necessitates purchase or acquirement elsewhere.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 75, line 14, after the words "United States," to insert "when time and facilities permit," so as to make the clause read:

That no part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for the salary or pay of any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person having charge of the work of any employee of the United States Government while making or causing to be made with a stop watch or other time-measuring device a time study of any job of any such employee between the starting and completion thereof, or of the movements of any such employee while engaged upon such work; nor shall any part of the appropriations made in this act be available to pay any premiums or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant; and that no part of the moneys appropriated in each or any section of this act shall be used or expended for the purchase or acquirement of any article or articles that, at the time of the proposed acquirement, can be manufactured or produced in each or any of the Government navy yards of the United States, when time and facilities permit, for a sum less than it can be purchased or acquired otherwise.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I desire to ask the chairman of the committee if, in view of the increase in the amount for naval aviation from \$15,000,000 to \$35,000,000 on page 7, he will not accept an amendment increasing the maximum limit of heavier-than-air stations from 6 to 9 and let the matter be worked out in conference? I do that because I am advised that when this limitation was put on the bill that failed last winter a larger number of stations were in progress of construction.

I should be very glad if the Senator would allow me to explain this matter.

Mr. PAGE. I am very well satisfied that it is going to lead to a good deal of opposition and discussion if the Senator proposes it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I want to state why I make the request, and if the chairman does not agree to it I shall withdraw it. A larger number of stations were in process of construction. I see the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] occupying the attention of the chairman, and for the present I shall desist.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator knows a great deal more about it than the Senator from Utah does.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I shall suspend for the present.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 30, following line 21, it is proposed to insert as a separate paragraph the following:

That the President is hereby authorized to nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate to appoint, Lieut. Commander Renwick John Hartung, United States Navy, retired, to be a captain in the United States Navy on the retired list: *Provided*, That for the purpose of longevity pay said Renwick John Hartung shall receive credit for service on the active list, and active service while on the retired list, and shall in time of peace be required to perform such active duty on the retired list as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe: *Provided further*, That said Renwick John Hartung shall receive no back pay or allowances by reason of the passage of this act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, this amendment just having been adopted, and observing that on page 29 an amendment was adopted which raised Capt. William R. Rush to the rank of a rear admiral, I will ask the chairman of the committee why it is necessary in a bill of this kind that we select some particular persons to be raised in their rank and recommend them without any recommendation coming from the President or the appointing power?

Mr. PAGE. I understand that if we wish to promote a man outside of the ordinary law there is no other way of doing it than through special legislation of this kind.

Mr. McCUMBER. I supposed that the appointment should be made in the first instance by the President. In this way you get around that by suggesting the appointment first, and providing the position, and then asking the President to make the appointment, which very naturally will follow. If there should be places created for meritorious persons, why would it not be the duty of Congress simply to create the places and allow the President to exercise his ordinary function of making the appointments in the first instance for the confirmation of the Senate?

Mr. PAGE. I will state to the Senator that I could not pretend to answer him. I only know that this matter has come before the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs and has been passed upon and has been approved. If the Senator desires to offer any amendment along parallel lines, I see no reason why it should not be made.

Mr. McCUMBER. No, Mr. President; I have no one in view for whom I want to secure a position or retire him with a certain rank, perhaps above what he would be entitled to. I leave it to the executive department to determine what appointments should be made. I simply do not like the system of singling out men by a committee or by some Senator and placing them upon the retired list, or promoting them, without reference to any action by the President.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, the only way in which this can be done in cases of especially meritorious service or in cases where injustice has been done is for Congress to act on all these bills to authorize the President to act in the case, which gives him an opportunity to do it. At one time, I think, we included 10 names of some of the best officers that were plucked by this plucking board. A great many of the officers that we have been including in our legislation were retired by the plucking board, who had to retire so many officers a year, whether they were efficient or inefficient. They could only come back first by Congress authorizing it, and we have always included in the legislation a provision leaving it discretionary with the President. If especially meritorious service has been performed by any officer in the Army or Navy, the only way in which it can be recognized is for Congress to authorize it, and then leave the appointment discretionary with the President to make it or not to make it.

Mr. McCUMBER. It seems to me that if the position is one that is open to be filled the President would have authority, without any further act of Congress, to fill the position, subject to confirmation by the Senate. If you need the other official position so that some good friend may receive it, then it would seem to me the proper method would be to create the position and allow the President to fill it.

Mr. SWANSON. An officer might be on the retired list, retired by the plucking board. The war came on. He came back into active service. He went into the Naval Reserve. The President can not promote him at all. He can not give him any recognition. All this does in many cases is to give the man the position which he would have held if he had not been retired by the plucking board, and for special services rendered in cases which the committee investigated and thought were meritorious and justified it, and where we thought the President would be justified in giving him the position.

Mr. McCUMBER. I think the Senator recognizes the danger of this method of procedure, when we find that a Senator upon the floor, moved by friendship or his feeling toward some particular individual, by an amendment immediately inserts a name to be promoted in the bill itself. The committee has not examined it, no one has reported upon it, and it becomes a part of the bill. I do not think the bill ought to be made a vehicle for individual preferences.

Mr. SWANSON. I was not alluding to the one that was recently adopted. I do not know anything about that case. But these were reported by the committee; all the facts were investigated, and the cases are very small, considering the long war and the number of men engaged. One was where a man was dismissed from the Marine Corps for cursing a citizen who insulted the uniform. He enlisted as a private and went through the war. The President could not reinstate him. We thought a man who did that certainly ought to be reinstated. The one that was introduced at this time I do not know anything about.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yet if it passes through conference that will become a matter of law as well as the rest of the bill.

Mr. President, while I am on my feet I want to ask either the chairman of the committee or the Senator who has just spoken with reference to another matter. When the war came on it was found necessary that a great many of those who had been retired, either through age or injury, should be reappointed and perform services in the war, and under such reappointment they performed their services, and many of them were promoted.

Of course, when the war is over they will necessarily be demoted to their original rank at which they were retired. It seems to me that some provision ought to be made whereby those who, through meritorious service, have honestly gained promotion might be retired, even though it is a second retirement, holding the position they held during the war.

I have had some correspondence, which I submitted to the Senator from Virginia. He informed me, as I understand, that the naval law now practically corresponds to the military law with reference to those promotions during the war period. In other words, a limit is fixed to which the promotions may go and below which they will not be demoted if returned again to private life. I can not understand why all those who have been in the war and have been promoted should not be retired with the grade to which they were promoted.

Mr. PAGE. I should like to ask the Senator if he would not deem it advisable to take up this matter in a separate bill and provide the different grades or ranks in which these men should serve?

Mr. McCUMBER. No; I should not take it up, because I am seeking information. It may be right and just as it is now, but it would seem to me that there ought to be the promotions. It may be possible that there would be so many of them during the short period of the war that it would be unjust to the country to incur the extra expense, but there ought to be some law with some limit upon it. I would appeal either to the Senator in charge of the bill or the Senator from Virginia to explain why they are not put upon the retired list at the grade to which they had risen during the war.

Mr. SWANSON. In the Army retired officers called into active service were permitted to be promoted as high as major. I think last year, or soon after, we passed a law permitting retired naval officers, when they came into active service, to be promoted as high as lieutenant commander, which corresponds to the rank of major in the Army. Army officers, when called to active service, could be promoted, as I have stated before, and then when they were retired they could be retired with the rank they obtained in active service, not exceeding the rank of major.

An amendment was adopted last year to the naval bill permitting naval officers when they came into active service, like a lieutenant, to be promoted as high as lieutenant commander, and to be promoted as rapidly as a man in active service would be promoted, provided his active service was equal to the service of the man in the active line in the Navy. Then we amended that by providing that when he was retired he should be retired with the grade he possessed by this promotion.

When you come to retiring officers who have obtained temporary rank at that rank, as suggested by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], that has not been done in either the Army or the Navy. A great many Army officers have been temporarily promoted to the rank of brigadier general. They will go back, some as majors and others as colonels. To promote a retired naval or Army officer to a temporary rank and then permit him to retain what he obtained in temporary rank would be doing more for the man not in active service than the man in active service. A great many men in the Navy, captains now, will go back and be lieutenant commanders or lieutenants, because as you reduce the size of the Navy the number of captains is reduced, the number of commanders is reduced, and the number of lieutenant commanders is reduced, and consequently the temporary rank of the active force is reduced. I see no reason why, if a man is a retired officer and goes back to the retired list, he should be retired at what his temporary rank was when the active man in the Navy will not retire with that rank.

The Army has permitted temporary appointments up to colonel. I understand it is a debated question whether or not they can retire with a rank higher than major, as provided in the Army bill. The only difference there would be between the Army and the Navy is that they are allowed to be promoted temporarily to one grade, and it is very doubtful whether the retirement law will permit them to be retired in a place higher than that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN in the chair). The bill is as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, if it is now in order, I desire to submit a motion to strike from the bill all after the word "work," upon line 3, page 75, down to and including the word "plant," in line 7 on the same page.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the proposed amendment.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Colorado proposes, on page 75, in line 3, after the word "work," to strike out the following:

Nor shall any part of the appropriations made in this act be available to pay any premiums or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senate committee eliminated that provision from the Army appropriation bill, and its action was sustained by the Senate. Consistent with our action there, we should eliminate this provision from the naval appropriation bill. The matter was discussed on that occasion, and I do not care to go again into the merits of the subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I desire to complete the statement which I was about to make when I had the floor a few moments ago.

In a bill that failed last winter the appropriation for aviation was considerably reduced and the maximum number of heavier-than-air stations limited to six. The department had in process of construction at that time a larger number of heavier-than-air stations than six, and this limitation caused the suspension of work on several of them. On one some two or three hundred thousand dollars had been expended. It occurred to me that it would be but fair to raise the maximum number to nine in view of the increase in the amount allowed by the House for aviation to \$35,000,000.

Mr. PAGE. May I ask the Senator if he is referring to the station in Texas?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is one of the stations I had in mind. Nearly \$300,000 had been expended there when work ceased on account of the limitation before referred to. In view of this situation opportunity should be given to consider the completion of the station. However, if the chairman thinks it inadvisable I shall not insist upon it. I simply submit it to him to see if he will agree that it go to conference.

Mr. PAGE. I think it inadvisable at this time to accept the amendment.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Would the Senator agree to seven instead of nine?

Mr. PAGE. No; I prefer not to agree to any change whatever.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Then I shall not press the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment and call the attention of the chairman of the committee to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 28, after the word "retirement" in line 2, insert:

*Provided, That no part or parts of any existing laws shall be construed as having discharged from the naval militia of any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia those members of the National Naval Volunteers, who were transferred to the Naval Reserve Force by authority of the act of Congress making appropriations for the naval service, which became a law on July 1, 1918, nor to prevent members of the Naval Reserve Force from being or becoming members of the Naval Militia of any State, Territory, or District of Columbia.*

Mr. KING. I reserve a point of order against the amendment until the Senator explains it so that at least I can comprehend the purpose in view.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not make a point of order. I do not know that it is subject to a point of order, because I do not think it changes existing law; it merely preserves the present status. It is largely a matter of legislative construction in order to remove doubt as to the effect of war legislation on the establishment of the Naval Militia. It involves no appropriation.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator kindly indicate the purpose which he has in view by the amendment which he has tendered?

Mr. POINDEXTER. The purpose I have in view is to make it perfectly clear to those who are interested in the Naval Militia in the several States. Of course, the States on the Great Lakes and on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts are the ones primarily concerned. Some of them are anxious to restore the activities of their Naval Militia, as provided for in the act of Congress of 1914, with which the Senator is familiar. By reason of the passage of the Naval Reserve act and the enlistment of the Naval Militia in the Naval Reserve of the United States some question has arisen, some doubt at least, as to the effect of those proceedings upon the Naval Militia, upon the right of a man who retired from the Naval Reserve to join the Naval Militia of his State.

I do not expect at this time to go into the question of the merits of the Naval Militia of the States. This amendment does not undertake to establish any new policy with regard to it. It



simply provides that the existing Naval Militia shall continue, the object being to allow the matter to go over in its present status under the law until the regular session of Congress.

Mr. SWANSON. As the Senator knows, at one time we had a very large Naval Militia, an organization similar in the Navy to what the Volunteers were in the several States, and last year we transferred them into the Naval Reserve and one corps of the State militia into the Naval Reserve. They were all united in one corps. This corps of reserves will go on the inactive list, and of course the State volunteers or the State Naval Militia will be on the inactive list in reserve in some of the States. This is in order to help the Naval Militia.

Something ought to be done, and it seems to me this could very safely go to conference. The department is preparing some legislation that they have not yet perfected to care for both the Naval Reserve and the State Militia.

I will be frank and say that I do not favor this entire provision. I think it ought to be very much modified. It allows a person to belong both to the Naval Militia and the Naval Reserve at the same time, which I think is objectionable. But I think something ought to be done to give the conferees an opportunity to take care of the Naval Militia at this time. The department has not yet perfected legislation so that we can put it on this bill. If it is done, it will be very efficient in helping the naval service.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Of course, it is not necessary to determine the policy as to the members of the Naval Reserve being allowed to join the Naval Militia, but I may remark in answer to what the Senator from Virginia has said that there is nothing inconsistent whatever in the members of the Naval Reserve joining the Naval Militia. As a matter of fact, the militia of the States is a reserve military force of the United States, both in its land forces and its naval forces, under the Constitution of the United States, subject to the orders and the regulations and the support of Congress. That is one of the enumerated powers of Congress.

Mr. PAGE. It seems to me this is a matter of a good deal of importance, and in view of its importance I am rather inclined to accept the amendment and let it go to conference.

Mr. KING. I will not press the point of order in view of the statement made by the Senator from Virginia and the statement of the chairman of the committee, provided the modification suggested by the Senator from Virginia will be made to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington and such additional provision as shall be deemed necessary to fully protect the situation. I am not in entire sympathy with the amendment as it has been tendered. I think some legislation is needed, and with the assurance by the Senator that it will be perfected along the lines suggested, I will withdraw the point of order.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CALDER. I offer the amendment I send to the Secretary's desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 29, after line 21, insert:

That all officers of the naval service or any branch thereof who have served on active duty in the war with Germany with the rank of commodore shall, upon the ending of hostilities or within six months after signing of a treaty of peace, be commissioned as rear admiral in the United States Navy and placed upon the retired list with the rank of and three-fourths of the highest pay of rear admiral, second nine, any act or parts of acts to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. POMERENE. May I ask the Senator how many new rear admirals that will make?

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. CALDER. Will the Senator reserve his point of order for a moment until I make an explanation of what the amendment really means?

Mr. SWANSON. I will.

Mr. CALDER. This amendment affects 28 former commodores in the American Navy. Most of these men resigned from the Navy with the rank of commodore; some were dropped from the Navy when they were captains and received the additional rank of commodore. The amendment will not increase the expenses of the Government a particle. It simply permits the increase of retirement rank to these men who went back to the service of their own accord, who were not compelled to go back, but who served during all the war, and now are to be given this additional rank without any cost on the part of the Government. I hope the Senator from Virginia will not insist upon his point of order.

Mr. SWANSON. I insist on my point of order. These officers were retired as commodores. We abolished that rank and made some of them rear admirals. This proposition would increase

their pay. We now have a pretty large retired list, requiring the expenditure of a great deal of money, and if we keep adding to it it will continue to increase. I make the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. On page 23, line 17, I move to strike out "April 7" and to insert "February 1" instead.

Mr. President, I offer that amendment for the purpose of according to the young men who enlisted in the months of February and March the same opportunity for discharge from the service which the bill gives to those young men who enlisted in the Navy after April 7, 1917. Diplomatic relations with Germany were broken off about the 1st of February, 1917; I think on the 1st of February; I know that the President appeared before Congress on the 3d of February and made the announcement. Enlistments were very rapid during that month and the month following, and these men enlisted with the same motives and under the same impulses as the young men who enlisted after the declaration of war, yet they are in the service for four years and can not be discharged sooner. I know that there are a great many applications for discharge which can not be entertained under the terms of the bill as it is now written, because the men enlisted after February 1 and prior to April 7, 1917.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President—

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Just a word further. At the time those enlistments were made the Navy regulation permitted any enlisted men to purchase his discharge from the Navy at the end of two years' service. That regulation has now been changed, and they can not free themselves from the service under it. It seems to me equitable that they should be put upon the same footing as those who enlisted after April 7.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, it seems to me that that is not only just, but that it ought to be done. A man who enlisted in February, expecting his country to get into war, deserves more credit than a man who delayed doing so for 30 days. This date was inserted because it was the date of the declaration of war. I do not see why a young man who volunteered in February, and who enlisted for four years, because he could not enlist for the duration of the war, should not have the advantage that was given to the man who enlisted later. It seems to me a man deserves much more credit for enlisting earlier and ought not to be penalized for doing so.

Mr. WARREN. Should not a similar provision be made in the Army appropriation bill? The condition is the same in the Army as it is in the Navy. I ask the Senator from Wisconsin, if he wishes to apply it to the Navy, why not have it also include the Army?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I shall be very glad if I can offer the amendment in that shape.

Mr. WARREN. I also make that suggestion to the Senator from Virginia; that it ought to cover the Army as well as the Navy.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It ought to go into conference amended as I have suggested; and I think then the conferees could so frame it as would make it apply to the Army as well.

Mr. WARREN. It could not be inserted as to the Army unless you put it in here.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am willing to make it cover the Army as well as the Navy.

Mr. THOMAS. There are no four-year enlistments in the Army.

Mr. SWANSON. Unless the provision for the Army is included in the Senate, I am afraid we shall have trouble; and even then we may be considered to be encroaching on the preserves of the Military Affairs Committee of the House.

Mr. WARREN. I think there will be no difficulty of that kind, and if there should be, if it is once in the bill it is a subject for conference. There are not a large number of men either in the Army or in the Navy who are in the class covered by the amendment; but it is exceedingly hard for the few men who, the moment they thought there was about to be a war, entered the service under the only law we then had, to be bound for six years—three years with the colors and three years in the reserves—while the men who were drafted and went in perhaps unwillingly, or whether they went in willingly or unwillingly, after 30 or 60 days are being discharged.

Mr. SWANSON. I do not think we ought to penalize a man who volunteered.

Mr. THOMAS. May I ask the Senator whether that was the law in force at that time? Were not enlistments made for one year and three years?

Mr. WARREN. Not at that time. The only law as to enlistments was for six or seven years—three or four years with the colors and the balance of the time in the reserves.

Mr. THOMAS. I had the impression it was the Chamberlain bill of 1916 that made the change.

Mr. WARREN. The change in reference to the one-year and three-year enlistments was made a short time ago.

Mr. PAGE. May I ask the Senator from Virginia if there is any reason why this particular feature should not be taken care of in conference on the Army appropriation bill?

Mr. SWANSON. The reason it can not be so taken care of is that it is not a matter of conference.

Mr. WARREN. It is not a matter of conference. The only way it can go into conference is by being put on this bill. When Army and Navy matters have come up in the Senate, there are men who are always on the lookout, as they should be, to obtain every benefit for one branch of the service that is given to the other. In fact, I think the law has not been abrogated which gives that privilege to the Navy. So I wish to see the same privilege accorded to the Army as it is proposed to accord now to the enlisted men of the Navy.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, at the suggestion of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] I will perfect my amendment by adding in line 16, after the word "the" and before the word "Navy," the word "Army." If on account of the difference of the enlistment term in the two branches of the service the amendment requires some modification, such modification can be made in conference.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Wisconsin if the words "Secretary of the Navy" in line 24 do not also need modification.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I think they do.

Mr. SWANSON. It should read "the Secretary of the Navy or the Secretary of War."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. After the word "Navy," in line 19, I move to insert the words "or the Secretary of War."

Mr. THOMAS. And the same in line 24.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, the suggestion is made to me that that amendment needs perfecting in two or three particulars, and I ask the Senator from Wisconsin if he will not give it a little more careful consideration, and see that a proper amendment is drawn. In that event, so far as I am concerned as the chairman of the committee, I shall be glad to accept it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, with the changes that have been made by the Senator—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, my attention is called to the fact that if the amendment is to be made applicable to the Army as well as to the Navy on the following page there are a number of places where changes must be made. I apprehended we were about to conclude the consideration of the bill, but if I can have time to look the bill over and make those changes I will do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Permission will be granted to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PAGE. I suggest to the Senator from Wisconsin to make the best arrangement he can of the language here, and then we can take care of it in conference, I presume.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If that be so, then I will leave the amendment as I have already proposed it, with the modifications which I have made.

Mr. PAGE. I should be very glad to have the Senator give the benefit of his legal judgment to me by saying that the amendments which he suggests may be made in conference. I should dislike to have a matter go to conference when it was not sent to conference in such form as to permit it to be legally amended. I am told that there is some objection to the amendment of the Senator on that ground.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I withdraw the amendment for the time being.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin withdraws the amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I notice on pages 72 and 73 a list of vessels of different kinds, the limit of cost of which has been very materially increased. I desire to ask the Senator from Vermont whether the 75 vessels—I think my count is correct—enumerated on those pages are included in what is called the naval program of 1916?

Mr. PAGE. They are all included in that program, or nearly all of them.

Mr. THOMAS. May I ask if these increases are designed to cover the armament as well as the construction of the various ships?

Mr. PAGE. They are, exclusive of armor and armament.

Mr. THOMAS. Can the Senator give an approximation of what the added cost of armor and armament will be?

Mr. PAGE. I am not able to give the Senator the aggregate cost of armor and armament for these vessels. Here is a sentence from the report, which I will be glad to read, in connection with the Senator's previous question:

The present estimated cost of the three-year program is \$686,000,000, toward which \$107,000,000 has been appropriated, leaving \$579,000,000 to be appropriated. (This is just approximate.)

The vessels of the three-year program which have not yet been commenced are: Nine fleet submarines, one transport, one destroyer tender, one repair ship, two battleships (Nos. 53 and 54; proposals are now pending on these).

The \$66,073,000 added to the program is for the extension of the limit of cost on work already authorized.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the increases in the limit of cost are additional appropriations, are they not? That is, the difference between the first and the second sums is an additional appropriation?

Mr. PAGE. I so understand.

Mr. THOMAS. And those increases amount to \$66,000,000?

Mr. PAGE. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, at the time this program was considered and adopted I ventured to offer some remarks in opposition to it, believing that it was entirely unnecessary, in view of the development of the submarine and of the airship, to expend so much money in the construction of surface vessels. I think that the developments and the experiences of the war have demonstrated the correctness of my suggestion then made. We are going ahead, notwithstanding the tendency of a treaty of peace containing articles for a proposed league of nations, with a naval expenditure that is very much in excess of anything which preceded the war, and we are now proposing to build battleships which, without armor and armament, will cost the people from \$15,000,000 to \$21,000,000 each, and battle cruisers costing, without armor and armament, \$23,000,000 each. I think it is safe to say that the added expense of armor and armament will make the cost 25 or 30 per cent greater than the amount here specified.

A few moments ago I read an extract from one of the Washington papers reciting the abandonment and scrapping of what were considered first-class battleships only a few years ago. If we are going to continue our aviation development, which I hope we shall, and if we are to prepare for strictly defensive warfare, which I trust may be the program, then expenditures of money for other than aircraft, submarines, and torpedo-boat destroyers do not address themselves to my sense of wisdom, especially in view of the enormously increasing cost per unit of these vessels.

The race between the first-class powers in naval construction prior to the war, and the determination of each to build the largest and best vessels necessarily involved an orgy of expenditure which largely contributed to the war feeling and to the ultimate outbreak of hostilities. Now, if we are to continue the construction of vessels like those which are here enumerated, we must expect Japan, Italy, and France to do the same thing. Notwithstanding the changed methods of warfare, notwithstanding the experiences which this war has afforded, the race for large, ponderous naval armaments seems to be the order of the future.

I have no intention, Mr. President, of holding up this bill or doing more than taking the occasion which is at present here offered of expressing my dissent from this program. I think as every year passes its waste will be demonstrated. I am not one of those who are able to believe that wars will disappear from the earth and that the nations will hereafter forever live in harmony together; but I am not disposed to encourage, by my vote at least, or by my silence, the construction of antiquated engines of warfare at enormous and constantly increasing cost to the Public Treasury, when the fact appears, and is admitted by some naval officers of high standing, that they are either obsolete or rapidly approaching a state of obsolescence.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I am in substantial accord with the views just expressed by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS]. It is not my purpose to interpose objections to the passage of this bill, or to indulge in any analysis of its provisions. It is imperative that the appropriation bills before Congress be enacted into law before the first of the coming month. This fact alone has prevented that scrutiny of the numerous appropriation bills carrying stupendous amounts which their importance requires.

I am a member of the Naval Affairs Committee, and feel reluctant to criticize this bill, because I have been unable to offer



any constructive criticism during its preparation. My membership upon other important committees which were holding daily sessions during the period the Naval Affairs Committee was considering this bill prevented me from giving but perfunctory attention to the hearings; in consequence of these conditions, I was unable to become familiar with many of the provisions of the bill, and the testimony offered in support of the same. I have, however, become sufficiently familiar with this measure to reach a general conclusion as to its merits, and what I conceive to be its imperfections.

In my opinion, the bill carries appropriations entirely too large with respect to numerous items, and in the aggregate carries several hundred millions of dollars in excess of the reasonable requirements of the hour. I am not satisfied that we should carry into execution the so-called naval program of 1916. Our experiences since that program was prepared are of such nature as to not only warrant but demand a material modification of the same. The Great War through which we have just passed is pregnant with important lessons. This bill, in my opinion, fails to take cognizance of the lessons so taught, and blindly pursues a course or policy adopted prior to the period when these instructive and illuminating experiences came to our country. A nation would be foolish, indeed, to continue the same military policy during the coming year as that projected two or three years ago. This war has revolutionized military operations. The use of poison gases, the employment of tanks and air craft, the massing of machine guns and heavy ordnance—these and many other developments in the art of war will compel a change in all military programs. So, too, the naval experiences of the nations engaged in this war demonstrate the necessity of changes in naval programs. But this bill in the main follows the lines heretofore laid out and ignores, in part, at least, experiences and lessons of the past.

In my opinion, the appropriation of five or six hundred millions of dollars for the coming year ought to be regarded as an extraordinarily large appropriation and ought to have been satisfactory to the most radical advocates of a great Navy.

I admit that the situation in which our country finds itself does not permit the abandonment of naval preparations. I am in favor of an adequate Navy, and one which meets modern conditions and the requirements of the times. But in making this statement I do not want to be understood as supporting a proposition which calls for an appropriation of the magnitude indicated in the pending legislation. The construction of some of the warships provided for should be abandoned, and a new program, well balanced, scientific, and up-to-date, should be adopted. Instead we are slavishly following an obsolete one, expensive, extravagant, and unnecessary. There should be a reduction in the personnel to one hundred and forty or one hundred and fifty thousand men.

I respectfully submit that the conditions in the world, turbulent and unsettled though they may be, do not now call for this gigantic appropriation.

The chairman and other members of the committee have given serious attention to the provisions of this bill, and I have no doubt feel that it is as satisfactory a measure as could at this time be devised. I am offering no criticism of my colleagues upon the committee, nor am I criticizing the representatives of the Navy Department whose suggestions and testimony influenced, no doubt to a very large degree, the action of the committee. It is a difficult thing to formulate wise and proper legislation to meet periods of transition, periods when nations are passing from a war status to peace. The conflicting and surging tides which at the present time run around the world augment the difficulties and add perplexities and complications of an extraordinary character. But considering the situation as best I can, I am constrained to express dissent from some of the provisions of this bill and to express my regret that the aggregate amount exceeded four to five hundred millions of dollars.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I do not want at this stage of the proceedings to take the time of the Senate to make any remarks upon the general policy of the bill, other than to say that I concur fully in the views expressed by the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] as to the excessive appropriations which the bill makes. If this session had been called to meet immediately after March 4, as it should have been, there would have been time to properly consider every item of this bill and every item of the Army bill which we passed the other day. The failure of the President to call Congress to meet at that time rendered adequate consideration of these measures impossible. The end of the fiscal year is near. The money must be provided for these departments to continue their work without interruption. We are in the position of being compelled to pass these great appropriation bills practically as they have been prepared for us. There is no time at this session to change

this big Navy and big Army policy. I am opposed to both now, as I was in 1916, and at the next session I hope Congress will be able to consider this subject with the thoroughness and deliberation demanded to properly dispose of the great problems dealt with in the Army and Navy bills. However, recognizing the necessity for quick action that confronts Congress, and realizing the futility of any effort at this time to change the policy that underlies these measures, I am content to merely voice my protest against the bill and to express my agreement with the views of the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING].

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated. The SECRETARY. On page 51, line 17, after the numerals "\$31,000,000," it is proposed to insert:

*Provided*, That no part of the appropriation carried in this paragraph shall be available if the mechanics and laborers employed under the same in the naval stations and navy yards of the United States are required to work regularly more than 44 hours weekly.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, during three months in each year the laborers and mechanics at the navy yards and naval stations of the United States work 44 hours a week. During the other nine months they are required to work 48 hours a week. The clerks and draftsmen in the navy yards and naval stations of the United States work only 42 hours a week. It has become the almost universal practice throughout the country to-day, in our trades and in our factories, that the men are required to work eight hours each day on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday and four hours on Saturday. The American Federation of Labor last week at Atlantic City unanimously adopted a resolution indorsing this very proposition. I trust that it may have the favorable consideration of the Senate.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is an attempt to place general legislation upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, it seems to me that the amendment is not subject to a point of order. It is a limitation, and I think it has been held repeatedly in the Senate that an amendment of that kind, which does not necessarily carry any additional appropriation, is not subject to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that it is new legislation, changing an existing statute, and therefore the point of order is sustained.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I think I have this amendment in form now.

On page 23, line 17, I move to strike out "April 7" and insert "February 1." Also, if I may state the entire amendment as affecting the whole subject, on page 24, line 13, I propose the same amendment, to strike out "April 7" and insert "February 1"; and then I move to add, at the end of the paragraph that concludes on line 4, page 25, the following:

*Provided*, That the privileges herein granted to the enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard as to discharge from the service are hereby extended to enlisted men in the Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. PAGE. I move that the Senate request a conference with the House of Representatives on the bill and amendments, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. PAGE, Mr. POINDEXTER, Mr. HALE, Mr. SWANSON, and Mr. SMITH of Maryland conferees on the part of the Senate.

ORDER FOR RECESS.

Mr. LODGE. I move that at not later than 6 o'clock to-day the Senate recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The motion was agreed to.

CLERICAL ASSISTANCE TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.

Mr. WARREN. From the Committee on Appropriations I report back favorably, without amendment, a joint resolution of a few lines, for which I ask present consideration. It refers only to employees of Members of Congress. It is not an appropriation of money, but makes the necessary changes so that their employees may be enrolled, as our clerks are, by name. I ask for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.,* That the appropriation in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act, approved March 1, 1919, for clerk hire for Members, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners may be paid by the Clerk of the House of Representatives to two persons to be designated by each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner, the names of such persons to be placed upon the roll of employees of the House of Representatives, together with the amount to be paid each, and Representatives, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners elect to Congress shall likewise be entitled to make such designations: *Provided*, That such persons shall be subject to removal at any time by such Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner with or without cause.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. GRONNA. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H. R. 3157) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

The Secretary read the report.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator in charge of the bill explain to the Senate the particular points of disagreement and the important amendments tendered by the Senate from which the Senate conferees receded?

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, the only amendment on which the conferees disagreed is amendment No. 13, which provides for the inspection of horse meat. I will say to the Senator from Utah that it was found that the language carried in the bill as it passed the Senate would not compel the labeling of this product. There is no opposition by anyone to this legislation, so far as I know. I believe that every Member of each House agrees that the product should be plainly labeled. That is the only amendment in disagreement.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator did not understand my question, or else I did not explain my position very clearly. The Senator will recall that there were a number of amendments tendered by the Senate. I should have been glad if the Senator would have taken the time to explain to the Senate, as doubtless few of us have had the opportunity to read the report, the disposition which was made of the amendments made by the Senate.

Mr. GRONNA. I think the amendment in which the Senator from Utah is especially interested is the last amendment, No. 92.

Mr. KING. Oh, there are others in which I was more interested than the one which I proposed.

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator that that amendment places a limitation of \$2,500 on the salary that may be paid to any employee in the Agricultural Department out of a lump-sum fund. The Senator knows that there is a permanent law which takes care of that, but the amount is much larger than the amount named by the Senator from Utah, namely, \$4,500. I sympathize with the Senator's intention to begin with economy. I am in hearty sympathy with it; but I will say to him in all earnestness that it will be impossible at this time to adopt this amendment, and the House conferees were unanimously opposed to it. We could not come to an agreement on that particular amendment, and so the Senate had to recede.

Mr. KING. Did the conferees attempt to formulate some other provision that would meet the situation, which, it seems to me, calls for some corrective legislation?

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator that that was discussed for a long time. I suggested that we might place the maximum lower than the present law and higher than the amendment of the Senator from Utah, but the House conferees would not agree to it. They said that at this particular time they did not believe it should be done; that in their judgment \$4,500 was not too much for the services that are being performed by the men who are being paid out of these lump-sum funds, because these men are scientists. They are employed in the various bureaus of the Agricultural Department, and it would be impossible to get along if the amendment of the Senator from Utah should be adopted. In other words, it would disorganize the entire Department of Agriculture. I should have been very glad to have the amount reduced somewhat. Of course, however, I should not have agreed to the amount that the Senator named in his amendment.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I suppose the Senate is powerless to enforce its mandate. Without expressing in any way any criticism of the conferees, especially the distinguished chairman of the committee, his statement does not quite indicate to me that the Senate conferees very earnestly insisted upon this amendment.

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator that we had a full statement of every one of these items printed in the Record. Of course, I could read them. The Senator, I know, will not ask me to do that.

Mr. KING. Certainly not.

Mr. GRONNA. We have made an effort to be as specific as possible. We were in conference on this bill for a week, and sat every day, and some days we sat until 11 o'clock at night; and I want to say to the Senator that we gave not only to his amendment but to all these items very serious consideration and very earnest consideration. We made the best fight we could to retain them. I am sure that my colleagues from the Senate will bear me out in that statement.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the amendment to which the Senator from North Dakota has particularly called my attention is not by any means the most important of the amendments made by the Senate, but I do insist that that amendment was aimed at an evil which must be corrected. During the time I have been in the Senate I have heard Senators repeatedly inveigh against these lump-sum appropriations, under which compensation is paid according to the whim and caprice and discretion of some executive officer. I think that to commit that power without limitation to executive officers tends to demoralize the service.

The Senator said that if this amendment were adopted it would disorganize the Agricultural Department. Of course, I can not assent to that broad statement made by the distinguished Senator.

Mr. GRONNA. I intended to say that that was the information the conferees received.

Mr. KING. I have no doubt that men in the department, in their importunities for an increase in compensation, and to induce the perpetuation of an evil system, painted to the committee some very terrifying pictures of the evils that would result if they were stripped of their power, and if the salaries paid were cut down to a reasonable sum. I repeat that this policy of making large appropriations to executive departments, with authorization to expend these large sums in such manner as they may see fit, without any limitation as to the amount which may be paid to one or more individuals, tends to a disorganization of the service of the Government. Certainly it inspires discontent with those who have employment under fixed salaries, and who are in the classified service, and whose compensation has been fixed, perhaps years ago, by statute or by some regulation.

We all have come in contact with the present evil, or, I was about to say, vicious system. The war has accentuated it. Bureaus have been created, or, at least, agencies and executive instrumentalities, a large number of them during the war, and large sums have been appropriated to those in charge of these executive instrumentalities, and they have been authorized to employ individuals for the purpose of discharging the duties pertaining to the particular work.

In most of those bills no limitation has been placed upon the discretion of the executive officers as to the number of employees or the compensation to be paid to each of them, and the result has been that these executive instrumentalities and agencies have invaded the regular departments, have offered compensation and salaries to employees who have been there for years greatly in excess, in some instances double and in some cases that have been brought to my attention treble the compensation which they had been receiving for years in the past. The result has been that men and women have been taken away from the work with which they were familiar in departments and bureaus where they had been employed for years and have been taken to these new instrumentalities, where they have received compensation very much in excess of that which they received in the past. That has led, of course, to discontent upon the part of thousands and tens of thousands of Government employees in the classified service found in the various departments.

I say again it is a mistake. In some of these departments five, ten, fifteen, and perhaps twenty-five thousand dollars have been paid to these new employees.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. GRONNA. I wish to say to the Senator from Utah that there is a great deal of merit in his amendment. I think I so stated before. I, of course, can not speak for the Members of



the House, but I believe the Members of the House are in sympathy with the idea the Senator from Utah has expressed in his amendment; that is, to get these men all on the statutory roll—that is, to get all these men on the statutory roll—and that the lump-sum appropriation should, as far as is possible, be done away with. I believe that is the intention of Congress in the future, at least of those Members who have given this matter attention.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me, I think we would be serving the public better if we would get many of them off the roll, because the public service is not very greatly improved by having them there, and many of them are fastening themselves upon the Government when the Government does not need their services.

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator perhaps misunderstood me, or I did not make myself clear. What I intended to say was that where the services of these men are required, instead of paying them out of lump sums, they should be placed on the statutory roll. The Senator knows there are men who have been in the departments for 20 years who are to-day paid out of these lump-sum funds. They are mostly high-priced men. Many of these men are new men, undoubtedly, and they are men whose services are required on account of their special knowledge of the science of agriculture. Of course, it is impossible for the department to have those men placed on the permanent roll, and we must make provision so as to allow the Secretary of Agriculture some latitude and give him an opportunity to employ these special men for this specific work. The Senator, I think, will admit that.

Mr. KING. It is of course gratifying to know that my amendment receives the sympathy of the conferees, but that is not quite satisfying.

Mr. GRONNA. I realize that.

Mr. KING. I do not quite agree with the Senator that all the persons to whom he has referred should come within the category of scientists. I wish I had the time to read a number of letters which I have received from persons familiar with many of these so-called scientists and their qualifications, men who are going up and down through the country, employed by the Agricultural Department as scientists, and I believe the Senate would withdraw that appellation as applied to them. There are men called scientists who are not scientists, men who are posing as scientists, who are pseudo-scientists, and who are obtaining compensation as scientists, but who perform the most ordinary class of work.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. SMOOT. I merely wish, in this connection, to call attention to the fact that the abuse of the expenditure of lump-sum appropriations does not apply wholly to what may be termed the scientists.

Mr. GRONNA. I hope the Senator will not put me in that position. I did not intend to say that they were used for that purpose.

Mr. SMOOT. No; I was not answering the Senator from North Dakota. I simply want to call attention to what came before our committee to-day to show the Senator the situation. There was a lump sum appropriated to one of the Government agencies where the statutory salary of a number of employees was \$875. Through the bonus of \$120 provided for this fiscal year and the amount paid to all of them out of the lump-sum appropriation, under what authority of law I can not conceive, these salaries were raised to \$1,490. The statutory salary of \$600 and the \$120 bonus allowed was also taken out of the lump-sum appropriation and raised to \$1,320, not one but all of them in that class.

Mr. KING. I suggest to my colleague that some of those heads of bureaus ought to be investigated; perhaps suit ought to be instituted against them to recover these expenditures illegally made, and it is possible their actions are such breaches of the law as to call for their removal.

Mr. President, just a word or two further along the general line I was discussing. When our country entered the war of course it became necessary to increase the number of employees. The result was that tens of thousands came to Washington, many more in my opinion than were needed. It has seemed to me that there is a predetermination upon the part of departments, bureaus, and governmental agencies to keep all in Washington and in the service of the Government those who were brought here for an emergency. Instead of there being an attempt to separate some of these individuals from the rolls there seems to be a determination to keep them upon the rolls as employees of the Government. Only a few thousand have

been discharged from the various departments, and in many of the departments and bureaus there are more people employed now than there were at any time during the period of the war.

Instead of endeavoring to reduce expenses and practice economy, many of these executive agencies are evincing a purpose to continue upon a war basis and expend the same or larger sums than the necessities of the war called for. Reductions will only come when Congress enacts appropriate legislation and refuses to make the appropriations demanded by such agencies and departments. As long as the appeals and demands of bureaus and departments and agencies and instrumentalities are controlling, this vast army of employees in Washington and throughout the country will be continued. I venture the opinion that every department and every executive agency represented here in Washington have submitted many reasons for continuing war agencies and war machinery and war appropriations. There are outcries and wails of despair when Congress attempts economies and threatens to reduce the number of employees or the compensation which was based upon war conditions. The result has been that committees have been halted in their desire and determination to cut down expenses and cut off appropriations for temporary organizations that should have died when the armistice was signed or soon thereafter.

We have appropriated such huge sums during the war that it seems to have affected our perspective, and we seem to be unable to appreciate the extent of our demands upon the Treasury. During the war the expenditures of the Government were necessarily stupendous; but we promised that as soon as the war was over the most rigid economy would be practiced and reductions would be made. Over and over again we said we would "cut to the bone" and we would reduce the number of employees and try to get down to prewar conditions again. But we are not doing it, and some appropriation bills seem to be mounting higher and administrative expenses in some governmental fields seem to be increasing.

The bill under consideration appropriates more money than was ever appropriated for this department in the past, except during the war to the general or regular appropriation, when there was a special appropriation made. Thirty-odd million dollar are appropriated in this bill for the Agricultural Department, and by far the greater part of the same goes for salaries to employees. There are more than 25,000 employees in the department; and in other departments similar conditions prevail.

I would like to see some general reform along the line of appropriations. I would like to see some true spirit of economy manifested here. We talk about economy, we promise that we are going to economize, we promise the people that we are going to cut down the taxes, but we then pursue a course that renders it absolutely impossible to effectuate any reforms or relieve the taxpayers from onerous burdens. It seems quite obvious that there will not be for some time, if at all, a reduction of the national annual revenue to \$4,000,000,000.

With the temper and spirit of the times, it would appear as though the burdens of taxation will be grievous and heavy for an indefinite period. There are hundreds of schemes and plans to get money from the Federal Treasury. There are few patriots urging us to remember the taxpayer and guard the funds and credit of the Nation.

We have just appropriated for the Army nearly a billion dollars for the coming year. The naval appropriation bill, carrying over \$800,000,000, passed this body within the past 30 minutes, and other measures will be presented for consideration during the next day or two which call for more than a billion dollars. When we come to raise the revenue, as we will have to do, we will hear from the people, and they will rebuke us for our extravagance. We should remember that when we spend money we must provide the way to obtain it. Now is the time to cry out for economy, to stand against the mad cries for appropriations, and to demand that the departments and executive officials, as well as all others who are connected with the Government, shall practice the most severe economy.

Mr. President, I know that this conference report can not be defeated. I am going to ask the chairman of the committee as soon as this report has been disposed of, or soon thereafter, to consent to the adoption of the following resolution:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of Agriculture is directed to report to the Senate of the United States the number of officials and employees of the Department of Agriculture, including the number who have been specially employed since the declaration of a state of war with Germany, with classification of the salaries received; also the number of persons who are employed as scientists or who are classified as scientists, and as to whether any of such scientists are employed outside of the city of Washington, together with a statement of the character of work done by such scientists, and when such work shall be completed, and report the number of such scientists who are receiving more than \$2,400 per annum, and the amount which they severally receive.

If the Senator is in sympathy with my efforts to effectuate some reforms and to strike at the evil of lump-sum appropriations, he will join with me in asking for this information. I submit that we ought to ask for information as to some of the other departments in regard to lump-sum appropriations, the disposition made of the same, the salaries paid, and the work and services rendered by those receiving compensation from lump-sum appropriations.

Will the Senator join with me in asking for the adoption of this resolution when the conference report is disposed of?

Mr. GRONNA. All I can possibly do will be to vote for the Senator's resolution. I assure the Senator I shall be glad to vote for his resolution when the conference report has been disposed of. I ask that the conference report be agreed to except amendment numbered 13, and that the Senate shall further insist on that amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I was one of the conferees on the part of the Senate on this bill, but Senators will notice my name does not appear as signing the conference report. It seems to me that I ought to say just a word in explanation of my declination to sign the conference report.

The conferees, both on the part of the House and on the part of the Senate, met for several days, forenoon, afternoon, and evening. They spent a great deal of time. They were all very earnest and very conscientious. I am not imputing any motive but the very highest to the any of them. The dispute that took up the time and brought about the delay arose over a very few amendments.

There was an amendment numbered 67 put on the bill by the Senate increasing the appropriation for agricultural extension work from \$1,500,000 to \$2,500,000. Most of the debate and discussion perhaps centered around that one amendment.

Another amendment was Senate amendment numbered 68. That is closely allied to the agricultural extension work in which the Senate increased the appropriation of \$551,280, made by the House, to \$751,280, being an amendment of increase amounting to \$200,000, to be used in farmers' cooperative demonstration work outside of the cotton belt.

The third amendment that had a good deal to do with the delay and the disagreement was amendment numbered 82, the Senate amendment making a new appropriation of \$2,000,000 to carry out the so-called Weeks bill for the purchase of land along the mountains of the Atlantic coast. The House conferees finally agreed to recede on the \$200,000 amendment. Am I right about that, I will ask the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, there were 10 amendments—

Mr. NORRIS. Yes, I understand; but I am only discussing these three principal ones.

Mr. GRONNA. There were 10 amendments on which the conferees could not agree, and the amendments which the Senator from Nebraska has named were included in those 10. Amendment numbered 67 is an appropriation for extension work, but it applies to cities having a population of less than 2,500 people.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I understand that; but I am asking the Senator whether the Senate conferees receded on that amendment or the House conferees receded on it?

Mr. GRONNA. The House conferees receded.

Mr. NORRIS. That is what I thought. I thank the Senator.

On the amendment appropriating \$2,000,000 to buy some of the Appalachian Mountain land an agreement was reached by which the House receded, with an amendment appropriating \$600,000 for that purpose.

On amendment numbered 67, for the agricultural extension work, the Senate conferees receded and no additional appropriation was made for that item. With entire courtesy and respect to the House conferees, I desire to say that they refused to make any compromise of any kind in regard to that amendment. I desire to say for the Senate conferees who have finally agreed to the conference report that they were loyal to the Senate's action and did everything they could to get the House conferees to recede or to get them to compromise. All kinds of propositions were made, in which all of the Senate conferees concurred, agreeing to various compromises as to that amendment; but at no time during all the days of discussions and quarrels were we able to get any concession whatever in regard to that particular amendment. It was because I believe that the conferees on the part of the House showed a disposition absolutely to refuse to give any consideration to the Senate's action, though it seemed to me to be the duty of conference committees, if they could, to reach some kind of a compromise, that I felt that if they were not willing to compromise in any degree I would not be willing to sign a report which did not get something for that particular Senate amendment.

Mr. President, there is a great deal of argument, I admit, on this question both ways; I am not claiming that the argument is all one way; but I conceive it to be the duty of a conferee, as well as of a legislator, where there is any disposition to compromise, to reach an agreement, to evince a willingness to attain that end.

The appropriation for agricultural extension work is, in part, to carry out an act of Congress passed a few years ago, which is known as the Smith-Lever bill, by which a graduated appropriation for agricultural extension work is made every year, growing each year \$800,000 until it reaches the maximum amount provided for in the law. The Agricultural Department claims that when the war came on, in carrying out an appropriation made by Congress to increase production, by which we gave them the money to extend the work provided for in the Smith-Lever bill a few years earlier than the bill then provided for, they formed an organization to carry on that work, which exists now, and that if this appropriation is cut to the House figures it will destroy that organization.

The effect of this amendment of the Senate is simply to ripen the Smith-Lever bill a few years sooner than it would have ripened under ordinary circumstances. Had the war not begun, had the war not existed, and had we not developed that work faster than the law itself provided, there would have been no contention now to increase this appropriation; but as the work did develop it was discovered to be a very popular as well as profitable piece of work on the part of the Agricultural Department. I think it is conceded that great good will come from it. It is an expensive proposition, but the good that is coming from the farm extension work is even not yet fully appreciated or realized by those who have had experience with it or had anything to do with it, either on the part of those who are doing the work or on the part of the farmers, and the farmers' organizations in different parts of the country are, as a rule, with very few exceptions, very high in its praise. With the bill left as it is in the conference report much of that work must be abandoned. We shall get up to this appropriation again as the years go on and the Smith-Lever bill gradually ripens according to its terms, but it seemed to me a matter of economy, while we were now administering the law as we must administer it in a few years and had the machinery to do the work, that it was the height of folly to stop when we knew we should have to start in again to build up this great machinery.

It is charged that in building up this machine so rapidly there have crept into it in the States inefficient men. There is no doubt, Mr. President, in my judgment, that to quite an extent that is true, and we should naturally expect it to be so; but those matters can be rectified; they can be taken care of, it seems to me, by continuing the work being done now rather than by dropping down two or three notches, and then building up again. I do not believe such a procedure is wise; I do not believe it is good administration. That is particularly true, Mr. President, when we take into consideration that the tearing apart of this machine and the breaking down of this work now will interfere in a great many places over the United States with the work the people locally and the administration officials of the Agricultural Department are now performing.

I realize that this session of Congress was not called until it was practically an impossibility for Congress, however diligent it might be, to pass the appropriation bills before the end of the present fiscal year. If it had not been for that condition, my judgment is that my coconferees would not have signed this report. We would have disagreed and fought it out. I sympathize very greatly with the desire—I have that desire the same as other Members of Congress—that we should as nearly as possible pass the necessary appropriation bills before the 1st of July. That is almost essential. I realize, too, that, since this conference report has been agreed to by the House, it is perhaps futile to try to defeat it in the Senate; in fact, I doubt the wisdom of trying to defeat it, and I am not trying to defeat it. I am not going to ask that it be rejected, for under existing circumstances it is almost imperative that this bill and several other bills be put into statutory form before the 1st of July. We are confronted with a condition which makes it advisable to accept what almost seems to be the inevitable. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] says he hates to do it; so do I.

While I am on my feet, Mr. President, I wish to say merely a word, not pertaining to the subject which I have been discussing, but in reply to the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], who I am sorry is not now in the Chamber. He has had a good deal to say against various items of this bill and has made criticisms, many of which are just and many of which, in my judgment, are not just. We ought to get out of our minds the idea that the Agricultural Department properly managed is not



a scientific institution. One of the most scientific businesses in the world to-day is agriculture. The Agricultural Department ought to have, and must have, if it is to perform what I conceive to be its duty, some of the best scientists in the world. The old idea that anybody who could not do anything else could operate a farm has disappeared, but I fear that there are some legislators who have lingering in their minds a recollection of the notion that used to be prevalent in years gone by.

In agriculture, chemistry, a purely scientific subject, is an absolute necessity. Engineers who understand all kinds of engineering are necessary. The amendment of the Senator from Utah that was tacked on to the agricultural appropriation bill prohibiting the employment by the Agricultural Department of anyone at a salary of more than \$2,500 a year would have brought ruin to one of the most necessary branches of the Agricultural Department. I happen to know of my own personal knowledge that the Agricultural Department has been handicapped ever since the beginning of the war because of its inability to pay the salaries which were necessary to retain the services of the right kind of chemists. They have lost some of their best chemists. Men drawing salaries of from \$2,000 to \$3,000 a year have gone to work for private corporations and institutions at salaries of from \$10,000 to \$20,000 a year, and the department has been unable to employ other chemists at the salaries they could pay.

If the Senator from Utah will amend the resolution which he read, and which, as it is drawn, applies only to the Agricultural Department, so that it will apply to every department in our Government, I will be glad to support it; but I am not in favor of picking out the Agricultural Department whenever we want to practice economy, and go to the Navy Department, to the War Department, the Department of Commerce, and the Department of Justice whenever we feel like being extravagant and want to expend a whole lot of money.

Much that the Senator says about lump-sum appropriations I think is proper, and I should be glad to have and I think we ought to have a report not only from the Agricultural Department, but from every other department, giving in detail the salaries and classification of all men who are paid out of lump-sum appropriations, but in my judgment the amendment the Senator from Utah thinks the most of is one that would bring ruin if enacted now.

We will find that unless the cost of living goes down we will have to increase some salaries not only in the Agricultural Department but in every branch of the Government where scientific knowledge is required of an employee. There are about as many such employees in the Agricultural Department as in any other, and there will be more, there ought to be more; we need more of that kind of men now. That is one reason why I do not want to see the Senate amendment in regard to the agricultural extension work entirely defeated.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from North Dakota if amendment No. 66, which was attached to the bill in the Senate increasing the amount of \$551,280 to \$751,280 for farm demonstration work outside of the cotton belt, was agreed to?

Mr. GRONNA. The House receded on that.

Mr. HARRISON. They have receded on that proposition and agreed to the Senate amendment; but on amendment No. 67, increasing the appropriation for farm extension work from \$1,500,000 to \$2,500,000, which the Senate adopted unanimously, the Senate receded?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. Farm extension work is most important. I agree with everything the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] has said about it, and I know that the Senate conferees have insisted upon it and have done well in trying to bring about the adoption of the Senate amendment; but before I get to that I wish to say that I understood from the Senator that there was one item in disagreement, the conference committee having agreed on everything else.

Mr. GRONNA. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. In view of the fact that the Senate has voted this increase of \$1,000,000 for farm extension work, voted unanimously for it, and the House has never voted on the proposition—

Mr. GRONNA. I want to say that the House has voted on it this afternoon again. The House has accepted the conference report.

Mr. HARRISON. I understand, but the Senator did not let me finish. Here is my point:

On this particular item there was a motion made in the Senate to increase the \$1,000,000 practically \$2,000,000 more. On a fairly close vote that amendment was rejected, but by a unanimous vote of the Senate the \$1,000,000 increase carried;

so the Senate, by a separate action, has passed upon that specific item and approved it. The House never has taken any specific action on it. The House committee brought out the bill carrying \$1,500,000. They never have voted on the proposition whether it should be \$2,500,000 or not. That question never has come up for discussion or for specific action by the House; but the action of the conferees in this report now is based purely on the action of the conferees of the House, three men representing the House. We do not know whether or not they are carrying out the sentiments of the House. Of course, we assume that they are; but the House has never passed upon that particular proposition.

In view of the fact that there is one item in disagreement, would not the Senator consent to a motion that might be made as a substitute for his, that the Senate refuse to recede on Senate amendment 67, and that the conferees upon the part of the Senate be instructed to insist upon Senate amendment 67? That would leave Senate amendment 67 and the other amendment in disagreement. It would go to the House, and the House then could pass on that proposition, separate and alone, and we could see what the sentiment of the House is.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I should be very glad to do that myself; but I will say to the Senator that, much as I should like to, the parliamentary situation is such that we could not do that without rejecting the conference report. We would have first to reject the conference report.

Mr. HARRISON. I understand that we could do that, or that I could file a motion as a substitute, for instance, or the Senator could, my motion being as a substitute that the Senate refuse to agree to the conference report on amendment 67 and instruct the Senate conferees to insist upon the Senate amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senate could not instruct its conferees until after it had first rejected the entire conference report, and then, after it had agreed to another conference, it could give any instructions it wanted to give to its conferees; but we would first have to reject the conference report, and the entire bill would have to go back to conference. I do not think there is any doubt about that. I am in entire sympathy, too, with what the Senator wants to do. I should be glad to do it.

Mr. HARRISON. May I understand the parliamentary status? The Senator from North Dakota is moving to agree to a part of this conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the only question that can be before the Senate is the question of agreeing or disagreeing to the conference report as a whole.

Mr. HARRISON. What becomes of the exception that the Senator from North Dakota made?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota must then make another motion asking the Senate to further insist upon its amendment in disagreement or else recede from it.

Mr. HARRISON. May I ask the Senator from North Dakota, in view of the peculiar situation and the strong reasons that have been advanced, and which the Senator from North Dakota believes to be well founded, will he submit to voting down the conference report, so that then we could get this matter into a parliamentary status where we could instruct the conferees to insist upon Senate amendment 67?

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I will be perfectly frank with the Senator from Mississippi and state that if the Senate should insist on the item which the Senator from Mississippi wants to increase, the \$1,000,000—

Mr. HARRISON. The Senate wants to do it, too.

Mr. GRONNA. If that is done, there will be no agricultural bill before the 1st day of July.

So far as the amendment in question is concerned, let me say to the Senator that I intend to move to concur in that amendment. In other words, I have written an amendment myself. The language supplied here on the floor of the Senate with reference to labeling horse meat was not in proper form. The inspection department would not have been compelled, under that language, to label it "horse meat." The proper language was supplied and offered in the House, and I agreed to it. I will say to the Senator that it is my purpose, as soon as the bill comes over, to move to concur in the amendment proposed by the House.

Mr. HARRISON. If the Senator from North Dakota will yield a moment, he makes the statement that if we do not agree to this conference report there will be no appropriation bill. Why does the Senator make that statement?

Mr. GRONNA. For the reason that the House conferees absolutely refused to give us another dollar for this extension work.

Mr. HARRISON. If the Senate should turn down the report and insist on this Senate amendment, certainly the House conferees would go back to the House and ask for an expression of the House on it. Does not the Senator think that is so?

Mr. GRONNA. Let me say to the Senator that the Senate conferees—and I know both my colleagues will substantiate what I say—called attention to the record vote which was had in the Senate on the motion of the Senator from Mississippi to increase the amount from two million and a half to four million and a half. On that amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi there were 24 yeas. Twenty-four of the Senators voted for that motion. Now, we called attention to that. We had the Record before us. We called attention to the fact, which the Senator has stated, that there was no objection to the \$1,000,000 increase; and we went to the trouble of hearing many witnesses before the committee of conference. We had men from New York, from West Virginia, and from several States. When they were asked the question, "How much money do you want, how much do you need, in order to carry on this work?" the House conferees were able to prove that there was more than enough carried in this particular bill. Now, the question was, where does that money go? Is it expended for administrative purposes or does it go for demonstration work? And the House conferees refused to give us another dollar. We offered, as the Senator from Nebraska has just stated, to recede from eight or nine other amendments if they would give us even a part of this appropriation, and they refused.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator has made the statement that the Agricultural bill would die unless we agreed to this report.

Mr. GRONNA. That was their statement—that they would not agree to another dollar for extension work.

Mr. HARRISON. There are three or four days remaining before the 30th of June. This is the 26th, I think.

Mr. GRONNA. I realize that.

Mr. HARRISON. And they could take it back to the House and get an expression from the House on the proposition.

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator that when the report has been disposed of the Senator will have, of course, the opportunity to make his motion.

Mr. HARRISON. I will not have an opportunity if the report is adopted. I was trying to get the Senator to agree, in order to carry out the wish of the Senate—

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator's proposition, of course, can not at this time be insisted on.

Mr. HARRISON. That is the trouble I am in. I am just trying to extricate myself from it, and I asked the Senator's help. Will not the Senator agree, in order to enable us to get a separate vote in the House, to have the Senate vote down his motion and allow us then to instruct the conferees?

Mr. GRONNA. I can not accept that proposition.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I simply want to say that there is no way of compelling the House conferees to take the matter back to the House.

Mr. HARRISON. I understand that there is not any way to compel the House conferees to take it back to the House, but if the Senate insists upon this proposition it seems to me that any conferees representing the House would do it.

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator that the House has already acted upon it, and has adopted the conference report.

Mr. HARRISON. The House has never acted on this item.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator? I think every angle of this proposition that could possibly be mentioned was taken up at the various meetings of the conference committees of the two Houses. The point which the Senator suggests, that the House has never voted on it and that it would be desirable to have a vote, was discussed at considerable length. I brought it up several times myself, and tried to work out an arrangement by which the House conferees would agree to go back to the House and get instructions on this matter. They refused to do that, and they claimed—I did not look up the Record, but they are all gentlemen of honor, and I have no doubt that what they said was the truth, so that I never even looked it up—they claimed that they did have a vote, not a roll call, but that they did have a vote on this particular item. They gave the result of that vote—a rising vote, too, I think. The Members were counted, and the result was announced. I believe—now, I am speaking from memory, and, as I say, I did not look up the Record—I believe they informed us that the proposition to increase this appropriation received only 37 votes in the House.

Mr. GRONNA. Thirty votes.

Mr. NORRIS. Thirty, was it? Well, something of that kind. Now, I think we could succeed in getting this proposition

again before the House. It would take some time to do it. Let us see what we would have to do:

First, we would have to reject this conference report. It only needs our concurrence now to make it law, and, in addition, our agreement to the amendment that the Senator is going to offer to what the House has added to the one amendment in disagreement. Then we would message back to the House that the conference report had been rejected, and the House would take action on that, and another conference would be asked and would very likely be allowed by each House. Another conference committee would be appointed, and that conference committee would have in disagreement all of the items, all of the Senate amendments. In other words, it would be just exactly where this conference committee was at the beginning. Assuming that both Houses appointed the same conferees—which might or might not be true, but probably would happen—we would meet the same contentions then that we met before. We know that as far as those conferees are concerned there could not be any arrangement—any sacrifice of anything else in this bill—that would bring about their consent to the allowance of a single dollar. Now, we would go on for a while until the Senate or the House got tired of waiting, and the conferees of either one or both Houses would probably be instructed to bring back some kind of a report, and they would come back with a disagreement; and when they came back they would ask for a separate vote in each House on this item.

If I had not been convinced, from the vote that the conferees gave us, that the House was practically unanimous against it, I would have thought there was some possibility of having the House refuse to stand behind its conferees. Then you must understand, too, that when it gets into the House of Representatives the conferees are unanimous; they are the representatives of both political parties; and there would not be anybody in the House entitled to the floor to defend the position which the Senate conferees had taken; so it would undoubtedly mean a long delay on this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that they insisted that this million and a half carried the appropriation under the Smith-Lever bill up the full amount that it would reach when it had reached its maximum, and that the \$4,000,000 was to be the permanent sum, and to put it beyond the permanent sum now would be ill-advised and not promotive of a permanent organization unless we intended to increase it.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to say to the Senator from Mississippi particularly that I would not hesitate to go to any length if I had a reasonable hope that at the end of the fight we could win out. That is the reason why I take the course that I do, because it seems to me that when we got through we would probably end just where we are now. I am afraid we are up against a hopeless proposition.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I am in perfect sympathy with the Senator from Nebraska on the Senate provision, but I yielded because I did not believe we could get it from the House; and as it takes both Houses to agree to legislation and to agree to an appropriation, if the other House is not going to agree to it, we can not get it. That was the view I took. I should like very much to have the appropriation.

Mr. HARRISON. Well, Mr. President, I believe that the appropriation is so necessary that I would go to any length within my power to obtain it; but since the conferees on the part of the Senate express themselves so convincingly and assuringly that they believe it is impossible to get it, of course we have reached the end of the limit; and I shall not be obstreperous, because I always try to comport myself in a very mild-mannered way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

#### SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. WARREN. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6176, the sundry civil appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6176) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.



The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 6 o'clock p. m., Thursday, June 26, 1919) the Senate, under the previous order, took a recess until to-morrow, Friday, June 27, 1919, at 11 o'clock a. m.

#### CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 26 (legislative day of June 23), 1919.*

##### UNDERSECRETARY OF STATE.

Frank L. Polk to be Undersecretary of State.

##### ENVOYS EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTERS PLENIPOTENTIARY.

Hugh S. Gibson to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Poland.

Richard Crane to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Czechoslovakia.

##### SECRETARIES OF EMBASSY OR LEGATION.

###### CLASS 1.

Charles D. Tenney.

###### CLASS 3.

T. Hart Anderson, jr.  
Ray Atherton.  
John W. Belt.  
Frederick C. Chabot.  
Matthew E. Hanna.  
Arthur Bliss Lane.  
Casper Y. Offutt.  
J. Donald C. Rodgers.  
Charles H. Russell, jr.  
Cornelius Van H. Engert.  
Walter C. Thurston.

###### CLASS 4.

Harold L. Williamson.

##### ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL.

Frank K. Nebeker to be Assistant Attorney General.

### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, June 26, 1919.

The House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WALSH).

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord God, our Heavenly Father, so move, we beseech Thee, upon the minds and hearts of Thy children and remove every vestige of war and transform them into lovers of peace—war is from beneath, peace from above; war is hell, peace is heaven; war is from the earth earthy, peace is Godlike—that the good old earth, with all its blessings, may be made a safe place for men to dwell in and happiness reign supreme; that the angels of heaven may smile upon us and the hearts of mothers rejoice in the happiness of their children; that Thy love, poured out on the Hill of Calvary 2,000 years ago, may be realized in every home, in every nation, to the glory and honor of Thy holy name; and praise be upon the lips of all men. In His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas will state his question of privilege.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, in the Record of yesterday morning, June 24, in a statement placed therein at the instance of Mr. John B. Densmore and as a part thereof, there appears on page 1713 of the Record the following:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, ss:

Mrs. Nana B. Riddell, of Chevy Chase, Md., being duly sworn, deposes and says:

That my attention has been called to the remarks of Congressman THOMAS L. BLANTON, and reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 5 and June 14, 1919, in relation to a trip made by Miss Jeanette V. Densmore on July 4, 1918; that to my own knowledge the statement made by Mr. BLANTON therein to the effect that Miss Densmore received transportation and Pullman reservations for three persons on July 4, 1918, from New York City to Atlantic City, N. J., is untrue.

I submit to the Chair that I have a question of privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman bases his question of privilege on a statement under oath of Nana B. Riddell

to the effect that the gentleman from Texas had made a statement which was untrue?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thinks the gentleman has a question of privilege.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I intend to take only a few minutes of the time of the House if I am not interrupted. I attempted to avoid the question of privilege yesterday by using general debate in the committee of which I was a member—

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York will state it.

Mr. CALDWELL. The gentleman yesterday occupied a portion of time—

Mr. BLANTON. This will not be taken out of my time.

Mr. CALDWELL. Occupied a portion of time discussing this same matter, and I made a point of order and his speech was cut in two, and the point of order I make now is that he has already discussed this subject, and it is not a question of privilege, because it has been discussed by the gentleman already.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thinks that the gentleman yesterday did not undertake to discuss the matter as a question of privilege. He was precluded from continuing the discussion by the point of order, and the Chair thinks it is now in order for him to discuss this matter.

Mr. BLANTON. Had I been permitted to take up this matter yesterday I would have done it in about five minutes, and I would have avoided the use of any time of the House at this time. After the Densmore statement was put in the Record I noticed that Mr. Densmore admitted parts of my contention, but denied others. My statement which is denied was that on July 4, 1918, Miss Jeanette V. Densmore, sister of the director general, at the railroad station in New York, under her mileage transportation book which she carried around with her, applied for and secured transportation from New York to Atlantic City, and that she obtained at that time Pullman reservations for three people. I also stated that on July 7 she obtained transportation and Pullman reservation for herself back from Atlantic City to New York. Mr. Densmore admits that she used transportation from New York to Atlantic City, and says it cost only \$1.25. He admits she used a Pullman reservation for herself from New York to Atlantic City, but said it cost only 98 cents, and that she paid for it out of her pocket. He admitted, however, that his sister, Miss Densmore, collected \$13.46 for this trip, and in this affidavit of Mrs. Nana B. Riddell she admits that two people who were not connected with the Employment Service did accompany Miss Jeanette Densmore from New York to Atlantic City. After noting these denials day before yesterday, I having gotten immediately from the clerk of debates the Densmore statement, just after my friend from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] got permission to insert same under leave to extend, I immediately took steps to obtain indisputable evidence of the fact that this Mrs. Nana B. Riddell is mistaken, and that Director John B. Densmore has misled and imposed upon us. I had addressed already, very fortunately, a letter on that same date, as follows, touching this matter to use in the hearing granted me before the joint committee of the Senate and House.

The following is the letter I delivered to the following Government employees in Director Densmore's department:

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 24, 1919.

Mr. STANLEY R. LYNN,

United States Employment Service, Washington, D. C.

SIR: The joint session of the Senate and House Committees on Labor have authorized me to present before such session to-morrow at 10 o'clock a. m., in room 201, Senate Office Building, certain evidence. I respectfully request that you kindly appear there at that time, as I desire to interrogate you concerning certain business of your department.

Kindly bring with you the following documents:

(1) The record card of travel for Luther C. Steward for months of July, August, September, October, November, and December, 1918.  
(2) Request for transportation No. L51736, signed by Jeanette V. Densmore July 4, 1918, from New York to Atlantic City, N. J., and the three Pullman coupons attached thereto, numbered, respectively, as follows:

Office No. 2357, Form 2, No. 5071; office No. 2357, Form 2, No. 5072; and office No. 2357, Form 2, No. 5073, all of same being from New York to Atlantic City, issued July 4, 1918.

(3) Request for transportation No. L51737, signed by Jeanette V. Densmore July 7, 1918, from Atlantic City, N. J., to New York, and the Pullman coupon thereto attached—office No. 2304, Form 43, No. 6206—from Atlantic City, N. J., to New York, July 7, 1918.

(4) Voucher No. 30682, travel expense, Miss Jeanette V. Densmore, for \$747.33; trip begun about September 3, 1918. I might add that I have personally inspected the above, and they should be easily found in your department.

I will ask you also to be prepared to tell what you know concerning about \$300 collected by Mr. Harry Parks, personnel section, official station, Washington, for trips he took away.

Also please investigate voucher No. 20479 for \$13.75 to Lillian Haberkost, Akron, Ohio, December 12, 1918, and voucher No. 27137 for \$12.70 to Lillian Haberkost, Akron, Ohio, March 6, 1919.

Kindly investigate voucher for \$15.10 giving reason of S. Tyson Kinsell to go to his home in Philadelphia.

Hoping that you will kindly comply with the foregoing requests, I am,  
Very truly, yours,

THOMAS L. BLANTON.

In compliance with this request, I will state to my colleagues of this House that in the face of the statement of Mr. John B. Densmore, Mr. Stanley R. Lynn, an employee of the United States Employment Service at that time, from Director Densmore's department, appeared before the joint session of the House and Senate Committees on Education and Labor, in Senate room 201, this morning, and looking Mr. Densmore squarely in the eye Mr. Lynn stated that up to two and a half weeks ago these three Pullman coupons from New York to Atlantic City, issued July 4 and used by Miss Densmore, were pinned to this transportation request No. L51736, which request, signed by Miss Densmore, he brought before the committee, but since that time, up to yesterday, they had been taken away from there and had disappeared from the department and were no longer attached to this request No. L51736. What became of them? Fortunately, very fortunately, this witness testified that some two and a half weeks ago I requested him to make copies of these three Pullman coupons, giving the numbers and full descriptions of same, and to give me a copy of same, which he did. He testified to that before the committee. Fortunately, that was done. Fortunately, three different people inspected these three Pullman coupons. If that had not been done, and if I had not used the precaution to preserve their numbers, so that the railroad can easily identify them, I would have this woman's denial standing in the RECORD with no proof of its incorrectness.

Now let us see. Mr. Densmore says that his sister did collect \$13.46 for the trip. He says she paid the 98 cents Pullman ticket out of her pocket, and that the other two ladies who went with her and whom he admits were not in any way connected with this Government, paid theirs.

If they did pay their Pullman fares, it leaves Mr. Densmore in a worse position than before. For, like Banquo's ghost, these three Pullman coupons issued July 4, 1918, office No. 2357, Form 2, and numbered 5071, 5072, and 5073, will not down, because until two and one-half weeks ago they were attached to the transportation request No. L51736, made out by Miss Jeanette Densmore herself in her own handwriting, and signed by her, and upon which trip she caused this Government to pay out \$13.46 in expense.

Now, did she collect for these three Pullman coupons?

Let us see. Three railroad tickets from New York to Atlantic City, at \$1.25, makes \$3.75. Three Pullman tickets from New York to Atlantic City, at 98 cents, makes \$2.94. One ticket back from Atlantic City to New York, \$1.25; and one Pullman ticket back from Atlantic City to New York, 98 cents, makes a total of \$8.92 for the three railroad and Pullman tickets to Atlantic City and one railroad and Pullman ticket back, which she used. That leaves \$4.54 balance that she collected for the expenses, because Mr. Densmore himself tells us that the expense was \$13.46 for this trip. I leave it to my colleagues to state whether John B. Densmore has attempted to mislead us on this item.

In connection with the other requests I made, Mr. Stanley R. Lynn, an honored employee of that department, brought before this joint committee this morning the other traveling-expense voucher—No. 30682—I asked him for when I sent him the said letter, showing that on September 3, 1918, Miss Jeanette Densmore started on another trip for which she collected from this Government \$742, going from Washington to her home in Polson, Mont., which is likewise the home of the director general of this bureau; that in going from Missoula to Polson she used an automobile, because she did not want to wait for the usual mode of travel. And the only thing disallowed her was when she paid tips over 25 cents to Pullman porters. They limited her to 25 cents a tip. On that trip she even went down into Florida, where some of my good colleagues go sometimes in the hope of finding perpetual youth. And in addition to her very large salary, she was allowed and paid this \$742 travel-expense allowance.

I do not take up the time of the House merely to deny this matter and show that my statement was correct, although I would have done it on that issue. The particular denial merely involves \$13.46, but I take it up for another purpose. I brought facts after facts before that committee this morning and yesterday, to show that by our action here in appropriating millions of dollars and turning them over to this department without any restrictions whatever, hundreds of thousands of dollars of the people's money have been wasted and misapplied. Yet we are still voting more money to this director general in lump-

sum rider appropriations without any safeguards or restrictions whatever.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing his question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman must proceed to discuss his question of personal privilege as made.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I will if you do not make me violate the question of privilege.

Mr. DENISON. I will not.

Did Mr. Lynn, in the course of his testimony, explain or give any specific excuse for the disappearance of these important documents?

Mr. BLANTON. He said that immediately after I placed that charge concerning that Atlantic City trip in the RECORD and after I had told him to make copies of them for me, so that if they disappeared there would be evidence of their existence, an honored employee of his department told him that Mr. Densmore had had that department searched from one end to the other to find the vouchers used by his sister and others. And it was after he was told that that he happened to find that they had disappeared, and the pin marks were still on this travel voucher—No. L 51736, which he brought before the committee—showing where those three Pullman coupons had been attached to it.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question.

Mr. BLANTON. I will.

Mr. MADDEN. What was the purpose of the travel in the case where the \$742 was paid?

Mr. BLANTON. The auditor, Mr. Burroughs, who had charge of that transportation, testified this morning before the committee that under the rules of his office that voucher, No. 30682, should have been submitted to him to approve the transportation portions of same. He said, despite that fact, it was audited and paid without ever having been submitted to him.

Mr. SEARS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I will.

Mr. SEARS. Who placed those pin marks on the paper?

Mr. BLANTON. I will let the gentleman go down there and find that out himself. I have time only to present other matters to this Congress.

Mr. SEARS. The gentleman makes an accusation. I thought maybe he would give it.

Mr. BLANTON. Since the gentleman's mind seems to be so cloudy, I will help him out on it.

Mr. SEARS. It is only clouded when the gentleman from Texas is speaking, and I want to get it clear.

Mr. BLANTON. I am going to remove the cloud.

Mr. Lynn testified that these three coupons were pinned to that document. At the time I asked him to make copies of them, giving me the numbers, so that the railroad company today could get those original Pullman tickets that correspond with those numbers and could furnish that evidence, he said when I called his attention to the fact that I wanted copies of them they were pinned to that document. All of them were pinned to the document when he saw them, and when I saw them last. And I will let the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SEARS] go home and figure out himself during the next few hours how the pin-pricks happen to be in the document.

I am not going to take up further time of the House except with this concluding remark, that if we have in this department of the Government a man in charge who has been drawing a salary of \$6,000 a year; fixed not by Congress but fixed by the department, if you please, out of blanket appropriations—if we have such a man, who will remove evidence from his department, if he did remove same—remove documentary evidence from his department that is damaging to his interests, I do not care whether that documentary evidence affects one dollar or a million dollars, I say that man has no right to be in charge of any department of this Government. I do not know who removed them. I do not know what caused them to be removed, but I know the person to whose interest it is to have them removed.

Mr. MACCRATE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I will.

Mr. MACCRATE. Did not the witness you produced before the Committee on Labor this morning admit that he took all these records out of the files of the department without the permission of his superior, never let the superior know he was taking them, and brought them to our committee this morning, and said he never even spoke to you about them until yesterday morning?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes, but he also stated that he had answered many questions I had asked him on a number of



occasions. The witness admitted that he acted upon the requests made in my letter to him, and that in bringing these documents before the joint session of the House and Senate committees he took them from the department under Mr. John B. Densmore, and I showed to the committee by the report of Mr. John B. Densmore to the Secretary of Labor, dated November 1, 1918, that he (Densmore) spent two whole months in California installing a dictagraph instrument in the office of a district attorney of California, not to help the Government ferret out evidence of crime, but to thwart the purpose of the Government and the prosecuting officers of the Government in apprehending and punishing criminals of this country. That is what I showed to your committee this morning. Talk about the committee! The committee knows that there was an effort to try to embarrass that young fellow by saying to him, "You did not have any right to bring these documents here." That was the stand taken by some one. He was asked by you, I believe, "Who told you to bring them here?" He said, "I received a letter from a Congressman, telling me to bring them before a joint committee of the House and Senate, and I thought I had a right to bring them."

I want to tell you here that he did have a right to bring them. If a committee of this Congress and a Member of Congress who is trying to protect the people of this country from improper practices in the departments, if a witness or employee of this Government, at the request of such a committee or such a person who is trying to apprehend such facts can not bring such evidence as a file of papers belonging to this Government before the committee, I ask you, in God's name, why can not he do it? I will ask you to answer that question?

Mr. MACCRATE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. BLANTON. I certainly will. I wish you would ask many of them.

Mr. MACCRATE. Did any member of the committee ask that the gentleman referred to bring the papers brought by this man, or did you or any member of the committee make a demand on the gentleman to bring those papers?

Mr. BLANTON. The committee did not ask it; but I did. The committee authorized me to bring evidence before it in a hearing, and I secured documentary evidence, requested witnesses to attend personally, and requested this witness to bring these particular Government papers from his office before the committee. I might add here what I told your committee yesterday. Before the hearings began yesterday I called two witnesses out of a gallery to find out what they knew, and while talking to them they called my attention to one of Mr. Densmore's employees, with his back turned to me, within 10 feet of me, who they said was one of Mr. Densmore's agents, and the fellow was eavesdropping, trying to hear what I was saying to the witness. It is needless to state that I paid my respects to this eavesdropper. And in this connection I will say what I said to the committee, that the gentleman from Texas is amply able, mentally, morally, and physically, if you please, to maintain whatever position he takes on the floor of this House or before any committee or anywhere else.

Mr. MACCRATE. The gentleman will concede that other members of the committee may do the same?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, yes. But I want this employment bunch to understand that the gentleman from Texas is able to take care of himself anywhere all along down the line, and you will find me taking care of myself. Are there any further questions?

Mr. Speaker, I thank the House for this time used.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, had requested a conference with the House on the bill and amendments, and had appointed Mr. WADSWORTH, Mr. SUTHERLAND, and Mr. CHAMBERLAIN as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

#### Senate resolution 94.

*Resolved*, That the language published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Tuesday, June 24, 1919, pages 1785 and 1786, in the report of an address to the House of Representatives by the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. JOHNSON, imputing dishonorable motives and conduct to the Senator from Ohio, Mr. POMERENE, is unwarranted, unjust, and untrue, and that said language constitutes a breach of privilege and is calculated to create unfriendly relations and conditions between the House of Representatives and the Senate.

*Resolved further*, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the House of Representatives and that the House be requested to take appropriate action concerning the subject.

#### ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H. R. 240. An act to authorize the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the Susquehanna River from the township of Conyngham, county of Luzerne, Pa., to the borough of Shickshinny, county of Luzerne, Pa.;

H. R. 241. An act to authorize the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the Susquehanna River from the city of Pittston, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to the borough of West Pittston, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania;

H. R. 242. An act to authorize the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the Susquehanna River from the township of Conyngham, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to the township of Salem, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania;

H. R. 530. An act for the construction of a bridge across the St. John River between Madawaska, Me., and Edmundston, Province of New Brunswick, Canada; and

H. R. 1711. An act to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Baton Rouge, La.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, the following resolution was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee as indicated below:

#### Senate resolution 94.

*Resolved*, That the language published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Tuesday, June 24, 1919, pages 1785 and 1786, in the report of an address to the House of Representatives by the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. JOHNSON, imputing dishonorable motives and conduct to the Senator from Ohio, Mr. POMERENE, is unwarranted, unjust, and untrue, and that said language constitutes a breach of privilege and is calculated to create unfriendly relations and conditions between the House of Representatives and the Senate.

*Resolved further*, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the House of Representatives, and that the House be requested to take appropriate action concerning the subject—  
to the Committee on Rules.

#### ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 5227, the Army appropriation bill, disagree to the amendments of the Senate to the same, and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Army appropriation bill, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. MONDELL. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from California how much the Senate amendments increase the total of the bill?

Mr. KAHN. The bill as it passed the House carried \$718,000,000. The bill as it passed the Senate, I am informed, carried \$888,000,000.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the gentleman from California and the other House conferees fully realize the attitude of the House in regard to these increases. I believe they are fully aware of the fact that there is a very strong sentiment in the House in favor of adhering approximately, so far as can be properly done, to the provisions of the bill and to the appropriations provided by the House. [Applause.]

I think the gentlemen realize that the House is so earnest in regard to this matter that the House will not agree to any conference report that considerably increases the appropriations or provides for new legislation on this bill, and that the House will expect an opportunity to express its views in the matter if there is any difficulty in arriving at a conclusion and an agreement approximately on the basis of the House bill. In view of this situation I shall not object, believing that the House view will be urgently insisted upon by the House conferees, and that in any event the House will be given opportunity to express its opinion if the view of the House as expressed in passing the bill is not virtually agreed to in conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MCKENZIE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Military Affairs, under the leadership of our distinguished chairman, declined to add any legislative provision to this appropriation bill. Many very important legislative pro-

visions have been added to the bill by the Senate, and I take it that it will be the policy of the conferees on the part of the House to resist such legislative provisions and amendments to this bill, and that if an agreement can not be reached on these matters the House will be given an opportunity to take action on them.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, there is no one on this floor who knows better the sentiment of the House regarding the size of the Army than does "the gentleman from California," and "the gentleman from California" will make every effort to secure the acceptance of the House provisions at the hands of the Senate conferees. [Applause.]

I have been a conferee on the part of the House for some years on the Army appropriation bills, and I do not recall that I ever refused or neglected to give the House an opportunity to express its views on any mooted question. I certainly shall not deviate from that course at this time. [Applause.]

In regard to the statement of my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE], I have always resisted the effort to fasten substantive legislation on the Army appropriation bill. Committees of the House and Senate ought to pass upon these questions, and after being fully considered by the committees they ought to be reported to the respective Houses so that all possible light can be thrown upon the questions at issue. [Applause.] I shall try to carry out the wishes of the House in that regard also.

Mr. LITTLE. Reserving the right to object, I should like to get a little information. I rather gather from some things I have heard in an unofficial way that the representatives of the War Department—the military caste—made their presentation of their case to the House committee and had it passed on by the House committee, and then by the House; but, not satisfied with the decision, they have gone before the committee of another body and have endeavored to present there an appeal, and have succeeded in securing a very considerable increase in the appropriations made by the House. Is that information correct?

Mr. KAHN. I will say to the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that the War Department submitted practically the same testimony to the Senate committee that they submitted to the House committee.

Mr. LITTLE. Tried their case over again?

Mr. KAHN. Exactly. But the House committee felt that it was time to take stock to find out where we stood; and in the rush of the few weeks that were to elapse before the 1st of July there was no opportunity to study these questions as fully as they should be studied. Therefore the House committee felt that the lowest possible amount should be given commensurate with safety, because the committee realized that only five months would elapse before the next appropriation bill would be presented.

Mr. LITTLE. The committee have found no reason to change their minds as yet?

Mr. KAHN. I have heard no indication on the part of any member of the committee that he intended to change his mind.

Mr. LITTLE. I am very glad, and I hope the committee will maintain that position.

Mr. KAHN. The conferees have always felt that they are bound to respect the views of the House when they go into the conference, and this will be no exception to that rule. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. LITTLE. Reserving the right to object, I think it is time for this House to take a position upon these things and stick to it. If we were right the other time, we are right now, and as far as I am concerned I do not propose to be bulldozed by anybody. If they do not want the appropriations that the revenue-raising body of this Congress gives them, let them go without, as far as I am concerned. [Applause.]

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from Mississippi rise?

Mr. QUIN. Reserving the right to object, the honorable chairman of the Military Affairs Committee states very plainly that he is going to give the House a chance to vote on these questions. Now, in the face of what the other end of the Capitol has done on this bill, increasing the appropriation for aviation from \$15,000,000 to \$55,000,000, and many other increases, and also raising the Army up to 400,000 men, in the face of what the House has done, I believe our conferees ought to stay out until the Capitol rots down before they agree to it, or, if they do agree to it, they ought to come back to this House and give us a chance to vote on it.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. They have said they will.

Mr. KAHN. I will say to the gentleman that before the conferees will agree to it they will come back to the House.

Mr. QUIN. And get further instructions from the House?

Mr. KAHN. Yes. [Applause.]

Mr. QUIN. With that assurance from the gentleman from California, I am satisfied.

Mr. MILLER. Reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee a question. Can he inform the House what became of that legislative provision of the bill as it passed the House to prohibit the War Department from buying additional land for military purposes?

Mr. KAHN. That has been amended by the Senate.

Mr. MILLER. To what effect?

Mr. KAHN. To the effect that those contracts which have been agreed upon shall be carried out, as I recall it.

Mr. MILLER. Does that carry the Camp Benning proposition?

Mr. KAHN. In part. I understand that as to some of the acreage the price has not been agreed upon, and, of course, that would not be involved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, only for the purpose of asking a question, I understood the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] to say that the military appropriation bill as it passed the House carried approximately \$718,000,000.

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And as it passed the Senate it carried \$888,000,000.

Mr. KAHN. That is my information.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That would be an addition of \$170,000,000 to the House bill. It seems to me that is the point of difference between the House and Senate, and the country ought to know it.

Mr. KAHN. I can say to the gentleman that, of course, a large part of that increase is due to the fact that the Senate agreed on an average Army of 400,000 men, whereas the House agreed to an average Army of 300,000 men.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and the Speaker pro tempore announced as conferees on the part of the House Mr. KAHN, Mr. ANTHONY, and Mr. DENT.

#### AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 3157, the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa calls up the conference report on the Agricultural appropriation bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Conference report on the bill (H. R. 3157) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the report.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the reading of the report be dispensed with, and that the statement be read instead.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the statement.

The statement accompanying the conference report was read.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3157) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 5, 8, 9, 11, 16, 25, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 45, 46, 47, 62, 63, 64, 65, 67, 69, 74, 76, 90, and 91.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 4, 6, 15, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 31, 38, 39, 40, 41, 48, 49, 55, 56, 57, 58, 66, 68, 77, 85, 87, 88, and 89, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert "\$525,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the



sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "\$327,680"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "\$4,326,121"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "\$5,783,231"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert: "Provided, That the limitation in this act as to the cost of farm buildings be increased to \$2,500 in so far as it applies to this paragraph: *Provided further*"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the emergency caused by the existence in the United States of flag smut of wheat, take-all, helminthosporium, and other destructive soil and seed infecting diseases of wheat and of other cereals, there is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$50,000, to be used in cooperation with the plant disease survey, investigation, and control authorities of the several States to prevent the further spread of and to eradicate or control these diseases."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"For the investigation, improvement, encouragement, and determination of the adaptability to different soils and climatic conditions of pecans, almonds, Persian walnuts, black walnuts, hickory nuts, butternuts, chestnuts, filberts, and other nuts, and for methods of growing, harvesting, packing, shipping, storing, and utilizing the same, \$20,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"For the investigation and improvement of fruits, and the method of fruit growing, harvesting, and, in cooperation with the Bureau of Markets, studies of the behavior of fruits during the processes of marketing and while in commercial storage, \$83,200: *Provided*, That \$20,000 of said amount may be used for investigating and developing new grape industries and methods of utilizing grapes heretofore used for the production of alcoholic beverages."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert "\$132,700, of which sum the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to expend \$50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the purchase of not to exceed 50 acres of suitable land near the city of Washington, D. C., and the erection thereon of all necessary buildings and equipment, and for the establishment of a plant-inspection and detention station: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$10,000 of this sum shall be expended for the purchase of the land: *Provided further*, That the limitation in this act as to cost of farm buildings shall not apply to this paragraph"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "\$2,529,378"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "\$3,379,638"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42,

and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"For the study and improvement of methods of dehydrating materials used for food, in cooperation with such persons, associations, or corporations as may be found necessary, and to disseminate information as to the value and suitability of such products for food, \$50,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "\$979,901"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "\$1,391,571"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "\$100,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"For conducting investigations and study of the nature and habits of the pest known as the camphor thrip, for the purpose of discovering methods of control and applying methods of eradication or control already discovered, \$5,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert "\$62,330"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "\$943,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "\$1,371,360"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "\$464,440"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "\$686,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "\$742,170"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 70: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "\$4,701,980"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 71: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "\$4,905,820"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 72: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect until their termination, the provisions of the proclamations of the President of June 18 and September 6, 1918, and the regulations thereunder, relating to the stockyards industry, including the employment of such persons as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, \$75,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"For collecting and distributing, by telegraph, mail, and otherwise, information on the supply, demand, commercial movement, disposition, quality, and market price of peanuts, and its products, \$12,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 74: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert "poultry, butter, hay, and other perishable farm products"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 75: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "\$1,339,175"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 78: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"That hereafter, in the performance of the duties required of the Bureau of Markets in the administration or enforcement of provisions of acts (United States cotton-futures act, 39 Stat. L., p. 476; United States grain standards act, 39 Stat. L., p. 482; United States warehouse act, 39 Stat. L., p. 486; standard container act, 39 Stat. L., p. 673; and the acts making annual appropriations for the Department of Agriculture) relating to the Department of Agriculture, the Secretary of Agriculture, or any representative specifically authorized in writing by him for the purpose, shall have power to administer oaths, examine witnesses, and call for the production of books and papers."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 79: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 79, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"To enable the Bureau of Markets to complete the work of the domestic wool section of the War Industries Board and to enforce the Government regulations for handling the wool clip of 1918, as established by the wool division of said board, pursuant to the Executive order dated December 31, 1918, transferring such work to the said bureau, \$35,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 80: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "\$2,811,365"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 81: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "\$31,355,811"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 82: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"That, in order to carry out the purposes mentioned in section 3 of the act entitled 'An act to enable any State to cooperate with any other State or States, or with the United States, for the protection of the watersheds of navigable streams, and to appoint a commission for the acquisition of lands for the purpose of conserving the navigability of navigable rivers,' approved March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. L., p. 961), as amended, there is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, available until expended, the sum of \$600,000 for the fiscal year ending on the 30th day of June, 1920."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 83: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the figure proposed by the Senate amendment insert "three"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the figure proposed by the Senate amendment insert "seven"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 86: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86,

and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"That the President is hereby authorized to extend invitations to other nations to appoint delegates or representatives to the International Farm Congress to be held at Kansas City, Mo., in September, 1919."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 92: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "\$33,900,211"; and the Senate agree to the same.

On the amendment of the Senate numbered 13 the committee of conference has been unable to agree.

G. N. HAUGEN,  
J. C. McLAUGHLIN,  
A. F. LEVER,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

A. J. GRONNA,  
HOKE SMITH,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

#### STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3157) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report as to each of the amendments of the Senate, namely:

On amendment No. 1: This amendment changes the name of "Office of Farm Management" to "Bureau of Farm Management." The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 2: This amendment changes "office" to "bureau." The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 3: This amendment increases the salary of the Chief of the Bureau of Farm Management from \$4,000 to \$5,000. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 4: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 5: This amendment changes "Office of Farm Management" to "Bureau of Farm Management." The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 6: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 7: This amendment increases the appropriation for inspection and quarantine work \$50,000, and adds a proviso making available \$50,000 to meet the emergency caused by an outbreak of sheep scabies in the Western States. The House recedes and agrees with an amendment as follows: Strike out "\$545,282" and insert in lieu thereof "\$525,000," and eliminate the proviso.

On amendment No. 8: This amendment increases from \$500,000 to \$800,000 the amount of money to be set aside for administrative and operating expenses for investigating the disease of tuberculosis of animals. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 9: This amendment decreases from \$1,000,000 to \$700,000 the amount to be set aside for the payment of indemnities when animals infected with tuberculosis are destroyed. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 10: This amendment increases the appropriation for investigations and experiments in animal industry \$40,000. The House recedes and agrees with an amendment as follows: Strike out "\$347,680" and insert in lieu thereof "\$327,680."

On amendment No. 11: This amendment authorizes the use of \$40,000 of the appropriation for investigations and experiments in animal industry for experiments, study, and investigation of the "soft pork" problem. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 12: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 13: This amendment increases the appropriation for meat inspection \$100,000 and adds new language authorizing the use of \$100,000 for the inspection of equine meat. The conferees have been unable to agree as to this amendment.

On amendment No. 14: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 15: This amendment increases the appropriation for investigation of diseases of orchard and other fruits \$5,000. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 16: This amendment adds a new proviso to the paragraph for the investigation of diseases of orchard



and other fruits and makes available \$5,000 for the investigation of the raspberry. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 17: This amendment adds a new proviso to the paragraph making appropriation for crop acclimatization and fiber plant investigations, removing the limitation in this act, as to this paragraph, to the cost of farm buildings. The House recedes and agrees with an amendment changing the proviso so as to read as follows: "Provided, That the limitation in this act as to the cost of farm buildings be increased to \$2,500 in so far as it applies to this paragraph."

On amendment No. 18: This amendment strikes out the word "more" and inserts in lieu thereof the word "less" in the proviso for cotton-seed interbreeding in the paragraph making appropriation for crop acclimatization and fiber plant investigations. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 19: This amendment strikes out "Provided further" and inserts in lieu thereof "And provided further" in the paragraph making appropriation for crop acclimatization and fiber plant investigations. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 20: This amendment inserts "location of and" in the proviso pertaining to the barberry bush, in the paragraph making appropriation for investigation and improvement of cereals, so the appropriation may be used both for the location and the destruction of the barberry bush. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 21: This amendment inserts "barberry bushes and other" in the proviso pertaining to the barberry bush, in the paragraph making appropriation for investigation and improvement of cereals, so as to make it clear that this bush along with others in which such rust spores originate may be destroyed. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 22: This amendment strikes out the proviso in the item for investigation and improvement of cereals setting aside \$20,000 for the investigation of take all, flag smut, and related diseases of wheat, oats, barley, rye, and rice. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 23: This amendment adds a new paragraph appropriating \$100,000 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the emergency caused by take all, flag smut, helminthosporium, and other soil and seed-infecting diseases of wheat and other cereal and farm crops, and provides the manner in which the fund is to be used. The House recedes and agrees with an amendment striking out of the Senate amendment "and farm crops," and "in the development of the field work of the Plant Disease Survey of the Department of Agriculture," and substitution "\$50,000" in lieu of "\$100,000."

On amendment No. 24: This amendment strikes out the item appropriating \$16,760 for testing and breeding fibrous plants in cooperation with the North Dakota Agricultural College. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 25: This amendment adds a proviso to the item for dry-land agriculture investigations, exempting this paragraph from the limitations of this act as to the cost of farm buildings. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 26: This amendment adds a new paragraph appropriating \$39,000 for the investigation, improvement, and the determination of the adaptability to different soils and climatic conditions of certain nuts, and the best methods of growing, harvesting, and shipping same. The House recedes and agrees with an amendment striking out "\$39,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$20,000."

On amendment No. 27: This amendment adds a new paragraph appropriating \$103,200 for the investigation and improvement of fruits, the method of fruit growing, harvesting, etc., and in cooperation with the Bureau of Markets to study the behavior of fruits during the process of marketing and while in commercial storage. The amendment also provides that of this sum \$20,000 may be used for investigating and developing new grape industries and methods of utilizing grapes heretofore used for the production of alcoholic beverages. The House recedes and agrees with an amendment striking out "\$103,200" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$83,200."

On amendment No. 28: This amendment increases the appropriation for investigations in foreign seeds and plant introduction, etc., by \$55,000, and adds new language authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to expend \$55,000, or so much as may be necessary, for the purchase of not to exceed 50 acres of land near Washington, D. C., and the erection thereon of necessary buildings and equipment, and for the establishment of a plant-inspection and detention station, and provides that not more than \$15,000 be expended for the purchase of land, and provides further that the limitation in this act as to the cost of farm buildings shall not apply to this paragraph. The House recedes and agrees with an amendment striking out "\$137,700," "\$55,000," and "\$15,000," and inserting in lieu thereof "\$132,700," "\$50,000," and "\$10,000," respectively.

On amendment No. 29: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 30: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 31: This amendment as a proviso to the item for the purchase of tree seed, cones, nursery stock, etc., authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to use so much as may be necessary, but not to exceed \$200, to purchase land now used as a forest nursery site for the Michigan National Forest. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 32: This amendment increases the appropriation for silvicultural and dendrological work by \$25,000. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 33: This amendment adds a new paragraph appropriating \$20,000 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with State agricultural colleges and experiment stations, to conduct investigations as to the fungi and bacteria causing decay in pulp and wood pulp, and to devise and apply methods of control. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 34: This amendment increases by \$50,000 the appropriation for the construction and maintenance of roads, trails, bridges, fences, etc., in the national forests. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 35: This amendment increases by \$50,000 the amount that may be expended for the construction and maintenance of boundary and range division fences, corrals, stock driveways and bridges, the development of stock watering places, and the eradication of poisonous plants on the national forests. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 36: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 37: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 38: This amendment provides for "one administrative assistant" at a salary of \$2,500 per annum in the Bureau of Chemistry. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 39: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 40: This amendment restores a paragraph appropriating \$20,000 for investigating the handling, grading, packing, canning, freezing, storing, and transportation of fish, shrimp, oysters, and other shellfish, and for experimental shipments of fish, etc. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 41: This amendment restores a paragraph appropriating \$15,000 for the biological investigation of food and drug products and substances used in the manufacture thereof. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 42: This amendment adds a paragraph appropriating \$100,000 for the study and improvement of methods of dehydrating materials used for food, in cooperation with persons, associations, and corporations, and to disseminate information as to the value and suitability of such products for food. The House recedes and agrees with an amendment striking out "\$100,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$50,000."

On amendment No. 43: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 44: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 45: This amendment strikes out the paragraph appropriating \$31,340 for exploration, investigation, and determination of sources of supply of potash, nitrates, and other natural fertilizers. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 46: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 47: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 48: This amendment increases the salary of the Chief of the Bureau of Entomology from \$4,500 to \$5,000. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 49: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 50: This amendment increases the appropriation by \$35,000 for investigations of insects affecting southern field crops. The House recedes and agrees with an amendment striking out "\$120,400" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$100,400."

On amendment No. 51: This amendment adds a new paragraph appropriating \$5,000 for investigating and studying the pest known as camphor thrip, and for studying and applying methods of eradication and control. The House recedes and agrees with an amendment as follows: Strike out the period at the end of the Senate amendment and substitute in lieu thereof a semicolon.

On amendment No. 52: This amendment increases by \$25,000 the appropriation for investigation, identification, and classifi-

cation of miscellaneous insects, and adds a proviso making available \$25,000 for investigations relative to the screw worm fly. The House recedes and agrees with an amendment as follows: Strike out "\$77,330" and insert in lieu thereof "\$62,330."

On amendment No. 53: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 54: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 55: This amendment increases the salary of the Chief of the Bureau of Biological Survey from \$3,500 to \$4,000. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 56: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 57: This amendment adds a new paragraph appropriating \$5,000 for improvements of the game preserves in Sullys Hill National Park. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 58: This amendment inserts the word "gophers" in the paragraph for investigating the food habits of North American birds, mammals, etc. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 59: This amendment increases the appropriation of the item for investigating the food habits of North American birds, mammals, etc., by \$100,000. The House recedes and agrees with an amendment striking out "\$489,440" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$464,440."

On amendment No. 60: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 61: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 62: This amendment adds "one mechanical foreman, \$1,400" in the Division of Publications. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 63: This amendment strikes out "five" before "skilled laborers, at \$1,000" and inserts "four." The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 64: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 65: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 66: This amendment increases the appropriation by \$200,000 for farmers' cooperative demonstration work outside of the cotton belt. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 67: This amendment increases the appropriation for cooperative agricultural work \$1,000,000. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 68: This amendment adds a proviso to the insular experiment station item, and grants or extends the same privileges as to leave to the employees of the Department of Agriculture in the Virgin Islands as are conferred upon employees in Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rico, and Guam. It also permits the employees to take at one time unused annual leave which may have accumulated within not to exceed four years, and be paid at the rate prevailing during the years such leave of absence has accumulated. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 69: This amendment increases the appropriation for home economics investigations \$30,000. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 70: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 71: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 72: This amendment adds a new paragraph appropriating \$75,000 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect until their termination the provisions of the proclamations of the President of June 18 and September 6, 1918, and the regulations thereunder, relating to the stockyards industry, including the payment of such rent and the employment of such persons and means as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary. The House recedes and agrees with an amendment as follows: After the word "including" in the Senate amendment strike out "the payment of such rent and," and, after the word "person," strike out "and means."

On amendment No. 73: This amendment adds a new paragraph appropriating \$12,000 for collecting and distributing, by telegraph, telephone, mail, and otherwise as to supply, demand, commercial movements, disposition, quality, and market price of peanuts. The House recedes and agrees with an amendment as follows: After the word "otherwise" insert the word "information."

On amendment No. 74: This amendment strikes out "poultry, butter, and hay" from the item for food products investigation service and adds "and other perishable farm products." The House recedes and agrees with an amendment restoring "poultry, butter, hay," stricken out by the Senate amendment.

On amendment No. 74½: This amendment strikes out "in interstate commerce" from the item for food-products inspection service. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 75: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 76: This amendment adds a proviso to the paragraph for the administration of the United States warehouse act, limiting the maximum salary of the employees under the provision to \$2,500 per annum. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 77: This amendment perfects and makes more workable the United States warehouse act by striking out of said act the following: In the first sentence of section 6 the words "other than personal security"; in the second sentence of section 6 the words "including the requirements of fire insurance"; and at the end of section 18 the words "if it have plainly and conspicuously embodied in its written or printed terms a provision that such receipt is not negotiable." The House recedes.

On amendment No. 78: This amendment restores a paragraph providing that hereafter in the performance of the duties required of the Bureau of Markets in the administration or enforcement of the provisions of certain specified acts the Secretary of Agriculture, or representative authorized by him for the purpose, shall have the power to administer oaths, examine witnesses, and call for the production of books and papers. The House recedes and agrees with an amendment as follows: After the word "representative" insert the word "specifically," and after the word "authorize" insert "in writing."

On amendment No. 79: This amendment adds a new paragraph appropriating \$35,000 to enable the Bureau of Markets to complete the work of domestic wool section of War Industries Board. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 80: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 81: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 82: This amendment adds a new paragraph appropriating \$2,000,000 for the purchase of lands under the Weeks law. The House recedes and agrees with an amendment as follows: Strike out "\$2,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$600,000."

On amendment No. 83: This amendment authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to expend not to exceed 4 cents instead of 2½ cents per mile for a motor cycle when used for necessary travel on official business. The House recedes and agrees with an amendment striking out "4" and inserting in lieu thereof "3."

On amendment No. 84: This amendment authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to expend not to exceed 10 cents instead of 6 cents per mile for an automobile when used for necessary official business. The House recedes and agrees with an amendment striking out "10" and inserting in lieu thereof "7."

On amendment No. 85: This amendment adds a new paragraph appropriating \$100,000 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to make agricultural exhibits at State, interstate, and international fairs held within the United States and provides limitations as to the amount to be expended in connection with any one fair. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 86: This amendment adds a new paragraph appropriating \$5,000, and authorizes the President to extend invitations to other nations to appoint delegates or representatives to the International Farm Congress to be held at Kansas City, Mo., in September, 1919. The House recedes and agrees with an amendment striking out all the language of the paragraph after "1919."

On amendment No. 87: This amendment adds a new paragraph authorizing the President to extend invitations to all nations interested in the manufacture or raising of cotton to appoint delegates or representatives to the World Cotton Conference to be held at New Orleans, La., October 13, 14, 15, and 16, 1919. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 88: This amendment adds a new paragraph providing that the word "package" where it occurs the second and last time in the act entitled "An act to amend section 8 of an act entitled 'An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded or poisonous or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes,'" approved March 3, 1913, shall include and shall be construed to include wrapped meats inclosed in papers or other materials as prepared by the manufacturers thereof for sale. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 89: This amendment adds a new paragraph providing for the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law. The House recedes.



On amendment No. 90: This amendment adds a new paragraph granting to the field employees of the Department of Agriculture 30 days' leave of absence each year. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 91: This amendment adds a new paragraph limiting the maximum salary of persons employed under lump-sum provisions of this act to \$2,500 per annum. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 92: This amendment represents an amended total.

G. N. HAUGEN,  
J. C. McLAUGHLIN,  
A. F. LEVER,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, the bill as it passed the House carried appropriations aggregating \$32,377,553. As passed by the Senate, it carried \$36,646,453, an increase of \$4,268,900. The conferees have agreed to an increase of \$1,510,658. In other words, the conferees have agreed to about one-third of the increases made in the Senate. The decrease is \$2,758,242.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I want to call attention to the increases, as was done as to the preceding bill, in order to emphasize the fact that whereas the House is endeavoring to save money and to live up to its pretenses of economy, increases are being inserted in another body overriding the will of the House. I ask the gentleman what was the difference between the total appropriation as the bill passed the House and as it passed the Senate?

Mr. HAUGEN. Four million two hundred and sixty-eight thousand nine hundred dollars.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The House passed it for \$32,377,000, and the Senate has added more than \$4,200,000, bringing the total up to \$36,646,000. By going to another body, those who desire to secure increases over the appropriations allowed by the House have had them inserted to the extent of upward of \$4,200,000 on this Agricultural appropriation bill alone.

Mr. HAUGEN. Might I suggest that the Senate committee increased the appropriation bill last session about \$6,000,000, while this bill they increase about four and a quarter million dollars?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. What was the principal increase inserted by the Senate?

Mr. HAUGEN. Two million dollars under the Weeks Act. The conferees allowed \$600,000. There was also a \$1,200,000 increase to the cooperative extension work. The conferees allowed \$200,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Of the \$4,200,000 increase, \$2,000,000 of it is to go for the purchase of land?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes; \$2,000,000 and \$1,200,000 for farmers' cooperative extension work. Two hundred thousand to be added to the \$551,000 for farmers' cooperative demonstration work outside of the cotton belt, which is not subject to the Smith-Lever Act, and \$1,000,000 to be expended under the Lever Act. The conferees have agreed to the \$200,000 to be added to the \$551,000, and the Senate recedes from the million-dollar item.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the Smith-Lever Act get \$2,000,000?

Mr. HAUGEN. Three million and eighty thousand dollars under the Smith-Lever Act and the \$1,500,000 granted by the House and agreed to in conference.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That goes into salaries largely.

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes; and all of it except \$480,000 to be matched by the States.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. What was the necessity of buying more land under the Weeks law at this time?

Mr. HAUGEN. That was the position taken by the House, but the Senate insisted on \$2,000,000. The best we could do was to compromise on \$600,000, a decrease of \$1,400,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Several appropriations have been extended on the other side for the benefit of expositions.

Mr. HAUGEN. One hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. They originated on the other side?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. May I ask what reason there is for expositions at this particular time?

Mr. HAUGEN. The department represents that there is great interest in the expositions. The appropriation carries \$100,000 for State fairs, and so forth. I think the gentleman

will agree that \$5,000 maximum for exhibits at a State fair can be expended to good advantage.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There is an outright appropriation of \$5,000 for the purpose of an international farm congress at Kansas City, Mo. Will that include the expenses of the foreign delegates who have been invited?

Mr. HAUGEN. No; that was stricken out. That went out of the bill. Authority is granted to extend invitations, but no appropriation for the expense of delegates.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. May I ask whether the daylight-saving law repealer remains in the bill?

Mr. HAUGEN. It remains in the bill, as put in by the Senate.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will not that conflict with the legislation enacted by the House?

Mr. HAUGEN. No; if the conference report is agreed to I think there will be no necessity to pass any further legislation, unless it is determined to fix definitely the zones.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I would like to know whether the gentleman can inform us if it is the thought of the conferees that the passage of this Senate rider in the appropriation bill on the daylight-saving law will be all-sufficient, and that Congress may proceed no further with the bill passed here the other day, which came from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce? If that is so, perhaps the House would have no chance to discuss the matter.

Mr. HAUGEN. My answer to that is, in the opinion of many, that is all that is required. Others may disagree. There are those who contend that the zones should be established definitely. There is, of course, a difference of opinion. The position taken by the House is that the zones should be established by the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Senate contends that should not be done. The provision in the bill as passed by the Senate simply repeals the act.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And the thought is that the agriculturists will get what they want if this rider passes, whether they get any further legislation or not.

Mr. HAUGEN. They will be satisfied.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. SIMS. The House passed a bill repealing section 3 of the daylight-saving law, which authorized the moving forward the clocks at a certain day in March of each year and back the last Sunday in October of each year. This section was all that was complained of before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The original law authorized the establishment of time zones by the Interstate Commerce Commission. That commission has acted and established the zones so authorized and made its report. Does this law as carried in this repeal provision make noneffective the zones already established, or does it make them permanent, rigid zones that can not be changed at all except by act of Congress, that provision of the law having already been executed? If the zones as established are rigid, because this complete repeal takes all power away from the Interstate Commerce Commission to do anything further, then it would require an act of Congress to change the zones so established; but if it makes null and void the zones so established, then it leaves all power to change or establish time zones alone to the railroads, without any authority of law or regulation as to what the zones may hereafter be, and I can not see why it was done, as the farmers did not ask for anything of that sort.

Mr. HAUGEN. The situation is this: The Senate proposition is simply to repeal the act; the contention is that or nothing, hence the whole bill hinges on this one proposition.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. While the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] is on his feet. Is it not the thought of those who inserted this rider in the appropriation bill that it will be safer, so far as a presidential veto is concerned, in an appropriation bill than it would be if it goes to the White House in a separate measure?

Mr. HAUGEN. I am not a mind reader.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Maybe the gentleman from Tennessee is.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. The paper and pulp industry has been very much interested in amendment No. 33 of the Senate, which provided \$20,000 for an investigation of the deterioration of pulp and pulp wood. Will the gentleman inform the House what has been done with that, and what provision, if any, has been made for carrying out that investigation?

Mr. HAUGEN. The work is now being done by the Bureau of Plant Industry, and it does not seem wise to duplicate the work or make appropriations under two heads. If an appropriation is to be made, the appropriation for the Bureau of Plant Industry should be increased. Our understanding is that although this is splendid work and ought to be continued and encouraged, yet, considering it in connection with other important items, the conferees did not see their way clear to increase the amount, and certainly not to make the appropriation under two heads.

Mr. SNELL. Does the gentleman understand that there is money enough available at this time to make that investigation?

Mr. HAUGEN. I so understand.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman thinks we can get the investigation with the funds already appropriated.

Mr. HAUGEN. That is my understanding.

Mr. SNELL. I want to ask another question. The \$1,000,000 that was added in the Senate for State Relations Service, which I understand goes to the farm bureaus of the country, was cut out in the conference.

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. How will that affect the individual bureaus of the country?

Mr. HAUGEN. Under the Smith-Lever Act, \$3,080,000 is available. The House added \$1,500,000; in addition there is an item of \$645,000 and one of \$551,000. The conferees have increased the \$551,000 to \$751,000. In all, the Federal appropriation is \$5,976,000, which amount must be matched by the States, counties, or municipalities, with the exception of the \$751,000 item and \$480,000 of the \$3,080,000, which may be apportioned unconditionally among the States; or, in other words, \$4,745,000 must be matched, which brings it up to \$9,490,000, plus the \$751,000 and \$480,000. We have about 2,850 counties, some sparsely settled. The service has been extended to about 2,400; hence there is on an average available for each of the 2,400 counties more than \$4,000.

Mr. SNELL. How much of that money is used up in administration charges and how much actually gets to the farm bureaus of the country?

Mr. HAUGEN. The complaint is made that in some way or another all the money does not seem to reach the counties in the States. Take, for instance, the gentleman's own State. There are 55 counties. You get \$111,000 from the Smith-Lever Act, \$58,000 from the million and a half dollars, \$7,800 from the \$551,000. The last amount has been increased \$10,000. The State matches the amount, the first amount by \$101,000; the second amount by \$58,000; the third by \$7,800; and, besides that, the State appropriates \$106,000. All told, you have an average of \$8,000 for each of your 55 counties.

Mr. SNELL. As a matter of fact, when it gets down to the counties—

Mr. HAUGEN. The contention is that this money is being absorbed here in Washington, or on the way. The contention of the gentleman from New York who appeared before the committee was that a large amount of the appropriation is used for the experts. There are 60 of them in New York, with 55 counties, more than one expert to the county. Sixty experts are carried at \$250,000, or more than \$4,000 per expert. Bear in mind that we make appropriations making available more than \$10,000,000 for the States Relations Service, but the bill carries \$32,000,000 for this and other activities and the experts are paid in part out of other funds.

And in the case of New York, as I understand it, in some instances, half is paid by the Bureau of Farm Management and the rest by the other bureaus; whatever the amount may be, that must be added to the \$10,000,000 available for this work.

Mr. SNELL. The contention among our people is that they do not get enough for the real farm bureau, where the farmer gets the benefit of it, but that the money is used and trickles along down before it gets to the fountain head. Is there any possible way to cut that off?

Mr. HAUGEN. That is a matter that has to be taken up with the Department of Agriculture. It is the arrangement that is made by the Secretary and the State colleges. That is, they determine what amount shall be expended for home economics or county agents, or experts, or what—

Mr. SNELL. Who appoints these experts?

Mr. HAUGEN. I think the experts are appointed here in Washington; the county agents are appointed by the colleges.

Mr. SNELL. Does not the gentleman think this department should be so arranged that they would get more money to the real farm bureau in order to obtain the full benefits from the appropriation?

Mr. HAUGEN. That is a matter that can probably be better decided by those who have the matter in charge. I, for my

part, believe that if each county is supplied with a county demonstration agent and an assistant in home economics that is all that is necessary, except the experts which are sent out by other bureaus. Of course, it is necessary to send out experts, but there should not be experts sent out by one bureau and then by another bureau, thereby duplicating or overlapping the work.

Mr. SNELL. The pay of these experts comes out of this money?

Mr. HAUGEN. Some. I understand in the gentleman's State, in many instances, half is paid by the States Relations Service and half by other bureaus.

Mr. SNELL. It is largely a matter of the administration of the fund; that is the reason why the Farm Bureau itself does not get any more money out of this enormous appropriation?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. I will.

Mr. DUPRÉ. I should like to ask the chairman what disposition was made of amendment numbered 87, inserted on the Senate side, in regard to the cotton conference in New Orleans. Is that item retained?

Mr. HAUGEN. That item is retained by the conferees. It simply gives authority to extend invitations.

Mr. DUPRÉ. In conformity with the bill introduced which heretofore passed this House?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. On page 98 is amendment numbered 82 that originally provided for an appropriation of \$2,000,000 to carry out the purposes mentioned in section 3 of the act entitled "An act to entitle any State to cooperate with any other State or States, or with the United States, for the protection of watersheds of navigable streams," and so forth—

Mr. HAUGEN. That \$2,000,000 was cut to \$600,000.

Mr. BLACK. That is quite a sum of money?

Mr. HAUGEN. It is.

Mr. BLACK. I want to inquire if that is one of the activities that ordinarily come under the administration of the Agricultural Department?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes; made so by the act.

Mr. BLACK. I have not had time to examine it.

Mr. HAUGEN. It is expended through the department and a commission; two Members of this House are members of the commission.

Mr. BLACK. I want to inquire further whether a similar appropriation has heretofore been carried in any bill?

Mr. HAUGEN. Eleven million dollars, under the Weeks Act, and that has been expended.

Mr. BLACK. Already?

Mr. HAUGEN. And the contention is now that we appropriate more money to take care of gaps between tracts already purchased and fill them up.

Mr. BLACK. This is furtherance of the plan already worked out?

Mr. HAUGEN. Exactly.

Mr. CANDLER. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. With pleasure.

Mr. CANDLER. Amendment numbered 11, put in by the Senate, specially set apart and authorized the expenditure of \$40,000 of the total amount appropriated for investigations and experiments in animal husbandry to be used for experiments, study, and investigation of the "soft pork" problem—

Mr. HAUGEN. That was cut out—

Mr. CANDLER. While that specific amendment was cut out, I understand, however, that within the general appropriation there is \$20,000 included to be used in the plan of work of the department for "soft pork" investigation, and that the \$20,000, out of the lump sum, is to be set apart for that purpose and will certainly be used to investigate the situation and conditions in reference to "soft pork."

Mr. HAUGEN. For the investigation of "soft pork"; yes.

Mr. CANDLER. Twenty thousand, then, will surely be used for that purpose. I was in favor of the \$40,000, but if that amount could not be allowed, I am glad the \$20,000 will surely be available. I am sure it will be a good investment.

Mr. HAUGEN. We compromised by cutting it in two and have an understanding with the department that \$20,000 will be used for the "soft pork" investigation.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, last spring this House passed a good many appropriation bills which never became laws because somebody else did not see fit to take a little time to enact them into law. Last year we sent over somewhere an Agricultural appropriation bill. The chairman tells us that somewhere else they raised it \$6,000,000, and we appropriated \$32,000,000 this year, which, I think, should have stopped there.



That was enough. We examined it carefully. They raised that \$4,000,000. We have employees down in the Agricultural Department who submit their evidence before the House committee on which the House reached the conclusion that \$32,000,000 should be allowed the Agricultural Department. Yet over there they held it should be \$36,000,000. How does it happen that these department bills are always raised over there? Why do our friends never cut department appropriations?

Gentlemen, I think it is time the work of this House began to receive more definite consideration. For two years we have been abused for idling and doing nothing, and there has never been a time within the two years that this House was not waiting on the departments for facts on which to decide whether their estimates were correct or on another body to finish the legislation we had well begun.

If there is any lack of respect for this branch of the Congress of the United States it is because you do not respect the House sufficiently yourselves. When you reach a decision it should, as a rule, stand. Your clerks hear you and then they think they can go somewhere else and slap on four or five million dollars any time they like.

This is the revenue-raising body of the United States. It was the intention of the Constitution that you should decide how much money the people should have to pay. That is the most important part of the work of the United States. All the executive officers are in your employ. Our conference committee has cut down a \$4,000,000 claim to a million and a quarter, and I shall not criticize it. But I think it is pretty near time that some conference committee said to some other conference committee that when the House has examined a matter carefully and reached a decision to save money, that money ought to be saved. I am not opposing the conference report. I would like to be able to say that the House appropriated only \$32,000,000 because the people need the money, but they ought to stick to it. I think the House ought to take its actions more seriously, and the next time somebody comes in here with a raise of millions of dollars, which nobody wants except those who spend it, the House ought to have enough respect for its convictions to live up to them. [Applause.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to direct attention to an amendment inserted by the Senate, No. 77, which was agreed to by the House conferees. That amendment seeks to amend the Federal warehouse law in three particulars. It seems to me that while the amendments taken separately might be considered unimportant and relatively insignificant when they are taken together and considered with reference to the purposes of the warehouse law they do weaken that law if they are not essentially vicious in themselves. In the first place, the warehouse law requires that the warehouseman licensed by the Government shall give a surety bond to abide by the law and the regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture and to carry out his contracts. I recognize that provision gives to the surety companies a practical monopoly of that business, and there may be some justification in providing for a bond secured by personal security in view of that fact. And if that were all that were done in this amendment of the Senate I do not think I should object to it. But, in addition to this requirement, the warehouseman is required to keep the products stored in the warehouse insured for the benefit of the owner. An amendment of the Senate strikes out that provision, so that the question of whether insurance shall be required to be kept for the benefit of persons having products stored in the warehouses is left entirely to the Secretary of Agriculture.

The third amendment strikes out a provision which provides that the warehouse receipt shall state the grade and quality of such products as cotton or wool. The result of these three amendments is this: That a warehouse receipt will be issued which will be backed by nothing more than the personal security of some citizens in the locality where the warehouse is located. The certificate will not be any assurance to the holder that the property stored in the warehouse has been insured or that the property is of any certain quality or value. So you have a certificate which is practically valueless in the hands of an innocent purchaser. And the whole amendment of the Senate, it seems to me, will result in great confusion, in fraud, and in destroying the purposes of the warehouse act, because the purpose of that act was to make a warehouse receipt as negotiable and as certain as to what it represented as a national-bank note.

I call the attention of the House and of the conferees to this matter because it may be that reasons were given justifying these amendments. But I have a great curiosity to know what those amendments are, in view of the weakening of the entire law which they accomplish.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY].

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct the attention of the conferees to amendment 88 that provides:

That the word "package," where it occurs the second and last time in the act entitled "An act to amend section 8 of an act entitled 'An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded or poisonous or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes,'" approved March 3, 1913, shall include, and shall be construed to include, wrapped meats inclosed in papers or other materials as prepared by the manufacturers thereof for sale.

The point I wish to call to the attention of the conferees is this: That for some time there has been more or less of a controversy regarding the effect of the net weight laws and regulations applied to the marketing and sale of wrapped meats.

I read in the paper the other day that food necessities have increased 92 per cent since the war began; and this amendment, if enacted into law, will defeat the very purpose for which it was introduced. I think that it has been adopted hurriedly for the amount involved, and it will reach into every home in the United States. Instead of making ham and bacon cheaper it is bound to increase the price of them.

It is not a new question by any means. It has been considered at great length heretofore and by people in authority; and after extended hearings and deliberation they decided that it was not necessary to stamp the net weight of wrapped hams and bacon.

During the past several years there has been more or less controversy regarding the effect of the net weight laws and regulations as applied to the marketing and sale of wrapped meats. Two questions have arisen—the first, whether meat wrapped in paper, cloth, gelatine, or other substances, are in "package form" so as to come within the package marking provisions of the net weight laws; and, second, whether the so-called net weight laws prohibit the sale of such wrapped meats at gross weight.

#### REASONS FOR WRAPPING MEATS.

1. To satisfy the demand among the best retail trade for a product of the highest grade and prepared in the most sanitary manner. The trade always has the option of buying wrapped or unwrapped meats.

2. The chief purpose of wrapping meats is a sanitary one. In the case of hams and bacon the same are wrapped immediately after they come out of the smokehouse, and this wrapping is kept thereon until the hams and bacon reach the retail dealer for sale to the consumer. As there is usually a considerable lapse of time between the smoking of hams and bacon and their ultimate sale to the consumer, this wrapping serves to protect the meat against dirt, flies and other insects, and the handling which smoked meats customarily undergo.

3. The wrapping also serves to retain the natural juices of the meat; that is, it prevents evaporation of the juices to some extent, and not only prevents shrinkage in weight but by retaining the natural juices, preserves the quality and flavor of the meat.

4. It prevents deterioration and wastage due to such deterioration; for instance, the cut surface of an unwrapped ham or side of bacon will become blackened and hardened and after long exposure to the air often necessitates the trimming of the cut surface as well as the rind.

5. It enables the packer to guarantee against spoilage for a certain period of time, varying in different communities, usually about 30 days. This is generally regarded by the retail trade as a big asset. The packers can and will make no guaranty against spoilage in the case of unwrapped smoked meats.

The application of this statute to wrapped hams and bacon was given most careful consideration by the committee appointed to formulate rules and regulations for the enforcement of the law, consisting of the Secretaries of the Treasury, Agriculture, and Commerce. Their deliberations covered a period of more than six months, during which time they thoroughly investigated the conditions under which wrapped hams and bacon were manufactured and sold in order that their conclusion might not be based upon any essential error of fact, and they procured the advice and counsel of their own solicitor as to the legal aspects of the subject. As a result the following official action has been taken under opinion given June 5, 1914, by the Department of Agriculture:

You are advised that, in the opinion of the department, single hams and single sides of bacon when covered, as you have described, with paper, gelatin, or cloth, for the purpose stated by you, are not in "package form" within the meaning of the net-weight amendment, and consequently it is not required that the quantity of the meat be stated on such coverings.

Respectfully,

C. L. ALSBERG, Chief.

There were produced under United States inspection in the United States during the year 1918 approximately 75,000,000 hams and 75,000,000 sides of bacon.

Approximately 70 per cent of the hams and 70 per cent of the bacon were sold by the packers in an "unwrapped" condition. The pieces were cured and smoked, labeled with a hot iron and were sold, without wrapping, at a price per pound, based on scale weight at time of sale, and never at a piece price for the whole.

Approximately 30 per cent of the hams and 30 per cent of the bacon, after curing and smoking, were "wrapped" as herein-after described. These wrapped hams and sides of bacon were then sold by the packers at a price per pound, based on scale weight at time of sale, the weight of the wrapping being included and charged for at the meat price, which is the same for wrapped as for unwrapped hams and bacon. Wrapped hams and sides of bacon are never sold at a piece price for the whole.

In every case the purchaser had the option to buy wrapped hams or bacon at the same price per pound as the unwrapped goods, and the dealer who purchased the wrapped hams and bacon knew that he was charged for the weight of the wrapping at the meat price; in other words, that he purchased at gross weights and that if he desired he might obtain unwrapped hams and bacon at the same price per pound.

Wrapping is partial protection against climatic influences and the attack of insects, and on wrapped hams and bacon the packers give a limited guaranty against spoilage from these causes. On unwrapped hams and bacon the packers give no such guaranty.

Wrapping is also a partial protection against "shrinkage" or loss of weight. Wrapped hams and bacon lose some weight, but not so much nor so rapidly as the unwrapped product.

The packer's guaranty against spoilage and the partial prevention of shrinkage are the main considerations for the payment for the wrapping.

The cost of wrapping to the packer, including labor and material in some cases, exceeds the price received by the packer for the wrapping through selling at gross weights. In other cases the amount received for the wrapping is slightly more than its cost, if no consideration be given to the expense involved in making good on the spoilage guaranty, which applies only on wrapped meats; but when the expense of making good on the guaranty is charged against the cost of wrapping there is no measurable profit or loss to the packer in the wrapping of hams and bacon.

Various kinds of wrapping are used, depending upon the season of the year, climatic conditions, and insect enemies which may be expected at the probable time and place of sale. More hams and sides of bacon are sold wrapped during the hot months of summer than during the winter, and naturally a wrapping which is adequate protection for meat sold in the more temperate localities is entirely inadequate to protect meat sold in the South, where the skipper fly is prevalent and the summers are more torrid.

On two-thirds of all the wrapped hams and bacon a paper wrapping is used, either one sheet of absorbent paper alone or one sheet of absorbent paper and one sheet of parchment paper. The parchment paper is secured by a string and a label is pasted on the paper, the whole not being sealed in any way. Even the unwrapped hams and sides of bacon are labeled, the label being burned into the meat with a hot iron.

The remaining one-third of the wrapped ham and bacon, or 9 per cent of the whole amount produced, is wrapped in one of the following ways: In a coating of gelatine, in muslin, in burlap sacking and one sheet of absorbent paper, and in so-called wash canvas wrapping, which consists of absorbent and parchment paper and a muslin sack, the latter being covered with paste. It is the custom of the trade for the dealers in ordering from the packer to specify the sort of wrapping they prefer as best suited to their locality and class of trade.

The weight of the wrapping varies not only with its style, but also with each particular ham and side of bacon, depending upon the size of the piece of meat and the conditions to which it has been exposed after wrapping. The sheets of paper vary in size, the packer aiming to use as small sheets as possible. This paper varies in weight even in sheets of the same size as the packer receives it, while the absorbent paper absorbs fat and moisture after it has been on the meat for some time, the quantity absorbed varying with the heat and other conditions. Any declaration of net weight of a ham or side of bacon based on the deduction of the weight of wrapping from the gross weight would necessitate the weighing of the wrapping used upon each particular piece, and even if this were done the net weight thus marked would not be correct even a few days afterwards because of shrinkage in the ham and the increase in the weight of the wrapping due to absorption of fat and moisture.

The actual approximate weight of the wrapping in the case of the hams wrapped with parchment paper is about 6 ounces avoirdupois. As stated, the parchment-paper wrapped hams and bacon constitute 70 per cent of all the wrapped hams and bacon.

The other styles of wrapping described are used upon the remaining 30 per cent of the wrapped hams and bacon, or 9 per cent of the whole number of hams and sides of bacon produced. Some of these other wrappings weigh more than the parchment wrapping. In the southern trade, and to a limited extent in other territory, the trade demands a wrapping which will protect from the skipper fly and from excessive shrinkage due to intense heat. For this trade hams and sides of bacon are wrapped in the so-called wash canvas, a covering which experience has shown to be nearly impervious to air and of a nature calculated to repel insects. This is the heaviest wrapping used. The meat is covered with two thicknesses of paper and finally with a cotton slip treated with a wash of a nature to keep out the air and also to repel insects. On the outer covering of a ham weighing from 15 to 16 pounds about 10 or 12 ounces of this wash is necessary to accomplish these purposes. There is no undue profit to the packer in selling hams wrapped in this manner. The percentage of hams and bacon so wrapped is not above 10 per cent of the total number wrapped. This is the class of wrapped goods sold under the strongest guaranty as to keeping qualities, and the cost of the material and labor plus the reclamations under the guaranty more than offset the seeming gain attained by selling at gross weight.

What proportion of all the wrapped hams and bacon goes to the consumer in the piece?

The proportion varies with the class of trade and the section of the country. In the plantation trade of the South and the ranch trade of the West a much greater proportion of wrapped goods goes to the ultimate consumer in the piece. In the city, where the hams and bacon are largely sold in markets and butcher shops, where cutting facilities are found, practically all is sold by the slice and none in the piece. In grocery stores, which have no cutting facilities, the trade is by the piece. In localities remote from cities, particularly in the West and South, more hams and sides of bacon are sold to the consumer as a whole than in other sections. The number of wrapped hams and sides of bacon sold to the consumer in the piece is constantly decreasing, due, perhaps, partially to the high cost of meat and partially to change in manner of living. From the best information obtainable by the packers, taking the country and production as a whole, it is believed that not over 5 per cent, or 1 in 20, of the wrapped hams and bacon go to the consumer in the piece. These figures may be slightly low, but it can be positively stated that not to exceed 10 per cent, or 1 in 10, of the wrapped hams and less than 10 per cent of the wrapped sides of bacon are sold to the consumer in the piece.

But the gentleman who introduced this amendment is defeating the very purpose for which it was introduced. Instead of decreasing, he is increasing the price of hams and bacon.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. I will be delighted to.

Mr. ANDERSON. If I understand the gentleman's argument, he is trying to show that it is a great privilege given to the consumer to pay ham and bacon prices for paper and string.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. I will say that at first blush the majority of people feel as the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota does, but let me tell you. You do pay the same price for the paper, which amounts to from 4 to 6 ounces, as you do for the ham and bacon, and the average person believes that it is outrageous to pay the same price for paper that you pay for meat. But when the ham is shipped to the retail butcher or grocer, he must weigh that ham or bacon in the presence of the consumer. Under the present circumstances the net weight of a ham is not stamped on it. As against the 4 or 6 ounces that you pay for in paper, there is a shrinkage, I will say to my dear friend from Minnesota, which amounts to twice as much as the paper. For instance, if the paper amounts to 4 ounces, the shrinkage will amount to 8 ounces.

Mr. ANDERSON. If I understood the gentleman's argument, the purpose of the paper is to prevent shrinkage.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. No. The purpose of the paper is to keep intact the natural juices of the meat, to make it more palatable, and to keep it sanitary and clean; and the person who buys the wrapped ham or bacon has the privilege of buying the unwrapped; if he buys wrapped ham or bacon, he pays for the paper, which is 4 or 6 ounces, and if this law goes into effect he will not pay for the paper, because the ham will be stamped with net weight, but he will pay for the shrinkage, which amounts to twice as much as the paper. Wrapping is a partial protection against shrinkage or loss of weight.



And, gentlemen, let me say this: To pack these hams and bacon will require an expense of from \$3,000,000 to \$6,000,000. It will be an overhead expense which must eventually be added to the cost of the ham and bacon. So that, gentlemen, here is the attitude of the industry: They do not profit by the paper, because with this ham that is wrapped they give a guarantee against spoiling for a certain length of time. They profit to the same extent on unwrapped hams and bacon as on wrapped hams and bacon.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does the gentleman know that the Federal Trade Commission estimated that the packers made a profit of about \$7,000,000 a year on this paper and string with which they wrap the hams and bacon?

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. I do not know what they found, but I believe that legislators in enacting a law should not do as this commission did. Before you enact legislation that will be injurious to the consumer you ought to have hearings and hear both sides of the case, and not take snap judgment.

I will say that the reason why the packers of this country are villified, and the reason why they are misunderstood by the public, is because of just such legislation as this. Instead of reducing the cost of meat to the consumer by the enactment of this legislation, you are going to increase the cost of it; and not only that, by this amendment you are going to permit the retail grocer or butcher when it is stamped to sell it without his weighing it. When a man buys it he has the right to buy it either wrapped or unwrapped, and if you stamp the net weight on it, then it will not be necessary for the retailer to weigh the ham or bacon. At present it is necessary. For instance, if this amendment is adopted, a man buys a 15-pound ham. It is not weighed at the shop, and if the consumer goes home and unwraps the ham and discovers that there are only 14½ pounds or 14½ pounds instead of 15 pounds he immediately begins to damn the packer more viciously than he has already been damned. I take it that the majority of you gentlemen want to be fair and want to reduce the price of the necessities of life. But do not attempt to do it in this way, because in this way you are increasing, instead of decreasing, the cost of these commodities.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENISON. I wish my colleague would explain why the consumer has to pay for the shrinkage of an unwrapped ham.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. He does not have to pay for the shrinkage of an unwrapped ham.

Mr. DENISON. I understood the gentleman to say that.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. No. If this law goes into effect, he will have to pay for the shrinkage on this wrapped product, and the shrinkage amounts to twice as much as the weight of the paper. For instance, experts who are familiar with the subject and practical men in the meat industry say that if the paper weighs from 4 to 6 ounces the shrinkage will amount to from 8 to 12 ounces; in other words, at least twice as much as the weight of the paper plus the enormous expense that will be entailed in order to stamp the net weight on each package. Gentlemen, understand they are now weighed in gross. There is an additional expense of anywhere in the neighborhood from \$3,000,000 to \$6,000,000, because each package must be weighed separately and then stamped. [Applause.]

The gentleman at the other end of the Capitol who introduced this amendment thought it would reduce the cost of living. Now, I come from a district where the people must work for a livelihood, and many make sacrifices in order to rear their families. I stand second to no one either in this House or the other end of the Capitol in the desire to do everything humanly possible to reduce the cost of living.

I want to see the laboring man's rights recognized. I want to see him receive a just wage. I am anxious that the consumers of these great United States be able to purchase the necessities of life at a reasonable price, and I am also anxious to see that men engaged in the industries receive fair return on capital invested.

All real Americans believe in fair play.

Now, the question most frequently asked is, "What is the matter with the packing business?" My answer is that the packers have failed to take the public into their confidence; that when they are attacked in this or any other legislative body they do not answer their critics. Their silence is construed by some to be an admission of guilt or a great disregard for the public. I do not believe that is their intention, however, and my desire is to have the producer, consumer, and packer understand one another.

I know if it was not on account of the way these great packing industries have perfected their business the consumer would have to pay a great deal more for meat. If it were not for the packer, we would not have been able to feed our Army.

Now, the question is, "Where does the profit go?" The answer to that is, The producer gets part of it, the commission merchant or the jobber gets part of it, and the retail butcher or the grocer gets part of it—how much I do not know, but the statement of the packers before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in the House of Representatives and before the Senate Committee on Agriculture in January and February, 1919, showed the packers' profit amounted to a trifle more than 2 cents on each dollar of sales, which is about one-half of 1 cent per pound. It is doubtful whether any other industry in the country does business on such a narrow margin of profit.

According to the statistics of the United States Department of Agriculture, the average person eats 193½ pounds of meat in a year. Thus a profit of one-half cent per pound would amount to only 97 cents for each person in a year. The packer receives less for the beef he takes from a steer than he pays for the animal. He makes his profit on the by-products.

The report of one of the packers for the year of 1917 showed that he paid \$84.45 per head for cattle and that he received \$68.97 for the meat from the steer. But, on account of the large scale of operations and a high degree of specializing in manufacturing, the packers can work on a small profit.

I shall always condemn unfair and dishonest practices, but believe that industries that are fair to the public and to the laboring man should be encouraged.

I hope I have made myself clear to the Members of the House on the matter before us. I am endeavoring to do what I suggested I would do on the floor of this House, resent any unfair or unjust criticism or any legislation which is objectionable to the people or the industries of my district. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON].

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I do not want to delay the passage of this bill, but I want to call attention to Senate amendment No. 89, which I think is an illustration of a very bad practice, and I think the conferees on the part of the House made a mistake in agreeing to it under any conditions.

This bill carries the appropriations for the Agricultural Department, which, of course, had to originate in the House. It went over to another legislative body, and there a legislative rider was tacked on to it. That is the provision for the repeal of the daylight-saving law. That is a matter that belongs to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees of both branches of Congress. It received the attention of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House, and we gave full hearings, and after full hearings and full consideration reported a bill to repeal the law. That bill passed the House on the 18th of this month, and since that time has been reposing in the room of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the Senate, which has jurisdiction to legislate upon that question. Notwithstanding that fact, that committee has taken no action, but the Agricultural Committee of the Senate tacks a provision for the repeal of the law in the form of a legislative rider on this appropriation bill. I do not think the conferees ought to have agreed to it at all, and I am going to tell you why. It leads to confusion and unwise legislation—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And there is no way to get at it without voting down the Agricultural bill.

Mr. DENISON. No; the gentleman is right.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is the advantage that has been taken of the House in that respect.

Mr. DENISON. Yes. If there was any way to get at it without delaying the passage of the Agricultural appropriation bill, I would be glad to have the House act in the matter, although I am in favor of the repeal of the daylight-saving law; but I am opposed to this practice of allowing another legislative body to tack legislative riders on appropriation bills, and I think the House ought to stop it.

Mr. HAMILTON. How does the Senate amendment differ from the House bill?

Mr. DENISON. The Senate amendment differs from the House bill in this respect: The original daylight-saving law contained four sections. Three of them provided for dividing the United States into time zones and fixing a standard time in the different zones, and the other contained what was called

the daylight-saving clause, which provided for retarding the clock at a certain time and advancing it at a certain time. Now, there was no complaint in the country at all concerning those provisions of the act which provided for fixing time zones and standard time. The complaint came concerning that provision of the law which provided for daylight saving. The act which the House considered and passed a few days ago simply provided for the repeal of section 3 of the act, which was the daylight-saving provision, and that is the only part of the law that the country wanted repealed. Now, the Senate in this rider repeals the entire law, so that if it goes into effect as the Senate has passed it in this bill the question as to what will be standard time in the United States is going to be very much in doubt; and that is a good illustration of the lack of wisdom of allowing another legislative body to put a legislative rider on a bill of this kind without mature consideration and without any hearings upon it.

Mr. ALMON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DENISON. Yes; briefly.

Mr. ALMON. I heard the colloquy between the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] and the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture in reference to the zones fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. ALMON. I want to inquire of the gentleman if it is not a fact that the Interstate Commerce Commission got its authority for establishing those zones by and through the daylight-saving law?

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. ALMON. Then, is it not a fact that the repeal of the daylight-saving law would repeal the zones?

Mr. DENISON. No; I do not think so. I have serious doubt about that, and I am going to explain why. I was just coming to that.

Prior to 1883 there was no standard time in the United States, but in that year the Association of Railway Managers arbitrarily fixed standard time zones in the United States to suit their convenience, and that was the only standard time we had in the United States prior to the passage of what we call the daylight-saving law. It was before then not a matter of law but a matter of arbitrary arrangement between the railroad companies.

When we passed the daylight-saving law we authorized the fixing of standard time zones by act of Congress. That act authorized the Interstate Commerce Commission to divide the country into time zones and to fix the standard time for those zones. Now, the Interstate Commerce Commission have done that. They have divided the country into zones and fixed standard time for those zones.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DENISON. I want a little more time. Is there any way to get it?

Mr. MADDEN. I ask unanimous consent that the time be extended 10 minutes, so that my colleague [Mr. DENISON] may have five minutes and that I may have five minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the time be extended 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. ALMON. I want to ask the gentleman whether he thinks that amendment that passed the Senate repealing the daylight-saving law destroyed these zones that he is talking about?

Mr. DENISON. I do not think it will. The daylight-saving law authorized the Interstate Commerce Commission to divide the country into time zones and to fix the standard time for those zones, and then authorized the Interstate Commerce Commission to change those zones from time to time.

Now, this rider repeals the law, but, as I understand, it will not undo what has been executed. It will cut off the authority hereafter of the Interstate Commerce Commission to change the time zones, and leave them permanently fixed as they have been fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission. Therefore, the rider placed in this bill will not accomplish the purpose that was sought by gentlemen at the other end of the Capitol. It is going to leave permanent the time zones fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the only way that they can be changed hereafter is by an act of Congress.

Mr. SEARS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. I will.

Mr. SEARS. It will set the clock back an hour?

Mr. DENISON. Yes; it will do that.

Mr. SEARS. In my State they changed the zones and set the clock ahead an hour and so changed the time two hours, so that we are sleeping in the daytime.

Mr. DENISON. I know there is much opposition to that feature of it, and we have changed that by the bill that passed the House. But the custom of allowing legislative riders to be tacked onto our appropriation bills at the other end of the Capitol is unwise and ought to be stopped in some way, if it can be done. This rider attached to this appropriation bill is going to lead to confusion. There is no doubt that those responsible for it thought it would repeal the power of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and not only that but that it would repeal what has been already done by the commission in fixing the zones. I do not think it will do that, or at least I have serious doubts about it. But even if it should annul what has been done, there can be no good reason given why the Interstate Commerce Commission is not as competent a body to fix the time zones as are the railroad corporations. The railroads have a right to go before the Interstate Commerce Commission and have a hearing, and if the action of the commission should not be satisfactory they could have the zones changed. At least we ought to have an arrangement for standard time zones fixed by law and not simply by the arbitrary action of the railroads themselves.

This action now of the Senate in putting this rider upon this bill, and of the conferees in accepting it, has resulted in the repealing of that part of the law which is good and ought not to be repealed. I thought the House ought to have its attention called to the effect of this amendment, to the end that something may some time be done to prevent this habit of putting legislative riders on appropriation bills.

Mr. SEARS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. I will, certainly.

Mr. SEARS. I am in hearty accord with the statements of the gentleman as to legislative riders, but under the rules of the House any Member could have made a point of order when the bill was originally up. We tried to pass it and some one made a point of order, and the only way we can get the provision on is by riders at the other end of the Capitol. I think that some way should be devised so we can vote directly on such a proposition in the House as the House wishes to.

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to a statement that appeared in this morning's Washington Post, from Julius Barnes, United States Wheat Director, which tells the condition of the wheat crop. On June 13 there were 40,033,000 bushels as compared with 18,599,000 a year ago. Yet the price of flour has increased over \$2 a barrel the past year. We have been told at various times that the price of flour was being increased every month or two because of the scarcity of wheat. And yet here are the official figures showing that at this very moment there are 40,000,000 bushels of wheat while the new crop is coming in, as against 18,000,000 bushels a year ago. There is certainly something rotten somewhere when such a condition exists.

Inasmuch as the high cost of living is the paramount question of the day, I am going to take advantage of every opportunity to call such facts as are contained in Mr. Barnes's statement to the attention of the country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield the gentleman one minute more.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I call the attention of the House to these wheat figures now because I think it is a matter which is up to the Secretary of Agriculture to do something about. Let him tell us the reasons for this condition of affairs. Bananas are being sold at prohibitive prices although the supply is largely in the control of the United Fruit Co. whose report shows that they are making \$40 a share independent of huge excise taxes.

Another fact in connection with this discussion on the high cost of living: Under the auspices of the Government last week a sale of canned meats was held and no bids could be submitted except for 30,000 pound lots. This does not look as though the people who own this meat were getting the right kind of a chance to bid upon it. I hope, therefore, with the passage of this bill with the additional powers conferred upon him that the Secretary of Agriculture will be able to put his finger upon the weak spots of the food administration so that the people may get proper relief. When President Wilson gets home I intend asking him to institute drastic measures that I hope will correct this situation.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much to find that the conferees on the Agricultural bill have agreed to Senate amendment No. 88. That amendment requires—



That the word "package" where it occurs the second and last time in the act entitled "An act to amend section 8 of an act entitled 'An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded or poisonous or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes,'" approved March 3, 1913, shall include and shall be construed to include wrapped meats inclosed in papers or other materials as prepared by the manufacturers thereof for sale.

The acceptance of the Senate amendment will add at least \$7,000,000 a year to the cost of the manufacture of the commodities sought to be regulated by this amendment. Of course, the gentlemen representing the House on the conference committee of the Agricultural bill must have realized that this expense will be passed on to the consumer. Now, it seems to me that they could have given consideration to the question of reducing the cost of living, instead of increasing it. I apprehend that these gentlemen, speaking for the House on this conference, must have known that the adoption of this amendment would increase the cost of living. But it seems that that side of the question was not taken into consideration at all.

Mr. TINCER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I have not the time. It did not appear to be of sufficient importance to consider the consumer of meat, if, by any chance, they could get a crack at the men who packed the meat. The consideration of the question along lines of research was not a matter before them, it seems. The preservation of meat by wrapping is absolutely necessary. The Federal Trade Commission, made up, as it is at present, of men who have no regard for any vested rights in America, has declared it to be their policy to crucify any man whose balance sheet shows a profit, but while you are crucifying these men who have money invested, who are ministering to the wants of the people of the United States and of the world, you ought not to be so unmindful of the men who have to buy, and the women and children who have to consume, because every time you add to the cost—although you may not have intended to add to the cost, but rather to take from the profit of the manufacturer—you thereby add to the cost of those who must buy from the manufacturer. Instead of doing any good, as this amendment pretends to do, you have done infinite harm to the American people. We are in a period of transition, and the cost of living is higher now than it has ever been. It has gone up by leaps and bounds, and our business should be to reduce the cost and not to increase it. I regret very much to be obliged to say what I have said, but I can not reach any other conclusion than that the action of the conferees of the House has added to the cost of the living of the people.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, does not the gentleman believe that the inevitable and necessary result of this is to add 3 or 4 cents to each ham, for instance, when it is wrapped?

Mr. MADDEN. Without doubt. It is almost impossible for any person in the United States to eat ham or bacon now; but we are represented on the Agriculture Committee by those who speak for the men who raise hogs. Yet they make it impossible for the men who raise these hogs to continue in business, because they make it impossible for people to buy the meat.

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCER].

Mr. TINCER. Mr. Speaker, I know that the gentlemen from Chicago who speak here are interested only in the consumer, and I know that they would not think of talking from any other standpoint. It is too bad that the Senate has suggested an amendment here that their constituents must quit selling paper under the guise of meat. I just want to suggest as a representative of the producer that if their constituents will give the consumer one little portion of the \$40 or \$50 a head they have taken off steers in the last 60 days, just one little portion, they could help the consumer more than you can help them on the floor of this House by a speech.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, when these gentlemen who represent the Chicago packers on the one hand and the Kansas producers on the other fall out in this House, I assume the consumer, whom I represent, will at last get his due. [Laughter and applause.] I want to emphasize the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON], who made a very good speech a little while ago about the inclusion of riders on appropriation bills. That is one of the evils of legislation which the newer Members of the House, as they grow in experience here, will realize. We pass a bill like the daylight-saving law, and we think we have a voice in it, only to find that when an appropriation bill comes back from conference somebody in another body has tacked on a daylight-saving repealer, and we have either to vote down the appropriation bill or vote it up, in order to get a chance to discuss the rider. Some day the House may rise on its hind legs and assert itself in matters of this kind. I am praying for that day.

Gentlemen talk about economy and endeavor to save the public money; they endeavor to reduce taxation now that the war seems to have come to an end. Yet, despite the fact that the House has laboriously sought to reduce appropriations in several of the routine appropriation bills, each one of them as it has come back from another body has come back loaded down with new and expensive items, which made the bill almost as oppressive as it was during war time. The Agricultural bill comes back now—after we have just heard about \$170,000,000 additional being tacked on to the Army appropriation bill—with \$4,200,000 additional over and above the appropriations authorized by the House.

I want to get it into the heads of the new Members of the House, and try to revive the memories of the old Members of the House, that the Constitution of the United States provides that revenue legislation shall originate in the House of Representatives. Some day it may be necessary—and I am glad the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], as the leader of the House, spoke on this subject a little while ago—to fight some of these appropriation bills after they come from conference. It may be necessary, some day, for the House, after it has given careful consideration to these bills, only to find them loaded over there with riders establishing new legislation and creating new bureaus and other expensive agencies of the Government, to say that they shall not pass. [Applause.] I believe I am about ready, if the Army appropriation bill comes back with \$170,000,000 more than the House provided for tacked to it by the Senate, to say to the Secretary of War, to the Chief of Staff, and to the hundred other agents of the War Department who go to the Senate after the bill has left the House to secure something the House would not sanction, that the responsibility for this added taxation on the people shall be fixed, and that it will not rest with the House of Representatives, even though an appropriation bill be defeated. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER].

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, the lecture that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] has delivered to the Senate of the United States I think is a wholesome lecture.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. I can not yield.

Mr. CALDWELL. Just for a minute.

Mr. LEVER. I was about to suggest, however, that the gentleman from Pennsylvania would have an easier way of reaching the powers that be in the Senate if he should make a little trip across there and speak to the leader of the Senate, who is from his own State, and tell the leader of the Senate—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. May I say that I think I know to whom the gentleman refers and he is entirely in harmony with the views I have expressed?

Mr. LEVER. Then he does not lead in the Senate. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think he does.

Mr. LEVER. Then he leads into trouble, as the gentleman himself admits.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think he is in entire sympathy with the expressions I have just made to the House.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman admits that he is the leader, and he then criticizes his leader in the Senate. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I was discussing bills which were handed down by a late Democratic administration.

Mr. LEVER. Yes; handed down by the late Democratic administration. Take the Agricultural bill, for instance, increased by the Republicans, when it was reported to the House, by nearly a million dollars, and it went to a Republican Senate and was there increased over \$4,000,000. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] Republican economy!

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I say to the gentleman it makes no difference to me whether it is a Republican Senate or a Democratic Senate, I stand by what I have just said. I myself draw attention to those increases.

Mr. LEVER. Now, the gentleman and myself are putting ourselves on a higher plane; I agree with him.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. We are both statesmen now. [Laughter and applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken and the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede from amendment No. 13 and to concur with an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HAUGEN moves to recede and concur with the following amendment:

"In the second line on page 19 of the bill as passed by the Senate, after the words 'page 674,' insert the following: 'as amended by the act of March 4, 1907 (34th Stats. L., p. 1256).'"

"In line 6, on page 19, after the word 'act' insert 'as amended.'"

"In lines 6 and 7, on page 19, strike out the following: 'all of the provisions of which are hereby made applicable to such meat,' and insert in lieu thereof the following: 'and hereafter no person, firm, or corporation, or officer, agent, or employee thereof, shall transport or offer for transportation, and no carrier of interstate or foreign commerce shall transport or receive for transportation from one State or Territory or the District of Columbia to any other State or Territory or the District of Columbia or to any place under the jurisdiction of the United States or to any foreign country any of such meat or food products thereof unless plainly and conspicuously labeled, marked, branded, or tagged "horse meat" or "horse-meat product," as the case may be, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture. All the penalties, terms, and provisions in said act as amended, except the exemption therein applying to animals slaughtered by any farmer on a farm, to retail butchers and retail dealers in meat-food products supplying their customers, are hereby made applicable to horses, their carcasses, parts of carcasses, and meat-food products thereof, and the establishments and other places where such animals are slaughtered or the meat or meat-food products thereof are prepared or packed for the interstate or foreign commerce, and to all persons, firms, corporations, and officers, agents, and employees thereof who slaughter such animals or prepare or handle such meat or meat-food products for interstate or foreign commerce.'"

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, amendment No. 13 increases the amount \$100,000 and adds this language—

of which sum \$100,000 may be used for the inspection of equine meat in the manner provided in said act, all of the provisions of which are hereby made applicable to such meat.

The purpose of the proposed amendment is to provide for the proper labeling of horse meat when sold. Under the proposed amendment it must be inspected and sold as such. It must be labeled, and the label or tag must state distinctly that it is horse meat. That is the purpose of offering the amendment. It seems to be a proper amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Why did you not bring in an agreement?

Mr. HAUGEN. I will say frankly to the gentleman that the amendment offered here would have been subject to the point of order if included in the report. It did not seem wise to bring in anything subject to a point of order in the report. We thought it should be submitted and stand upon its own merits.

Mr. CANNON. This is to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes; it provides for the proper labeling of the meat. It transfers it from the pure-food act to the meat-inspection act, and unless this amendment is agreed to all that would be required would be to stamp the meat "inspected and passed," which, in the opinion of many, is not sufficient and that it would be better to have the label state what the meat is.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois. Can the gentleman state for the benefit of the House how much horse meat is consumed in this country during a year?

Mr. HAUGEN. I could not state that. There are six plants in operation in the United States at the present time.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois. Where are they located?

Mr. HAUGEN. I can not say—one is at Milwaukee. I can not say where the others are. I am told there are six of them. They are under State inspection law and not operating under Federal law. We are now extending the Federal inspection service to horse meat, and the amendment provides, as I have said, for labeling it.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CANNON. That is to be tagged the same as the other meats?

Mr. HAUGEN. With other meat all that is required is that it be inspected and passed. The amendment will compel the tagging of this, the tag stating that it is horse meat, so that there can be no deception.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KINCHELOE. As I understand the chairman of the committee, the motion pending is to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment. Now, I had not heard any preferential motion being made to concur in the Senate amendment. My inquiry is this: Suppose the gentleman's motion to concur with an amendment is voted down, with no preferential motion having been made to adopt the Senate amendment, what will be the status of the amendment at that time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It will still remain in disagreement. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I would like about five minutes.

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I want to put some figures in the Record, suggested by the remarks by my friend from Illinois and others who have spoken on the meat situation. I take these figures from the Bureau of Markets, along the line of foreign production, and I especially ask the attention of the Members of the House to these figures with reference to the significance on the price of meats to-day.

We are told constantly that we must send our food to Europe because of the conditions there, and it is not necessary for anybody to emphasize the fact that if Europe becomes a market of our surplus products and makes a demand on the basis that her suffering is such that we must feed her at any price, the prices of food products here must inevitably be exceedingly high. There is no doubt about that. The figures will indicate whether all Europe or at least parts of it are suffering from the want of meat, especially live stock.

Cows and heifers in milk or in calf in the United Kingdom in the year 1914, 4,595,128; 1917, 4,514,803; 1918, 4,603,841. In 1918 there were more of this class than in 1914.

Other cattle, 2 years old and above: 1914, 2,330,200; 1917, 2,338,407; 1919, 2,289,684. The number in 1917 was higher than in 1914; the number in 1918 a little more than in 1914.

One year old and under two: 1914, 2,586,988; 1917, 2,757,222—200,000 more; 1918, 2,747,295 (200,000 more in 1918 than in 1914).

Under 1 year old: 2,662,189 in 1914; in 1917, 2,771,804; in 1918, 2,670,329, making a total in 1914 of 12,184,505 head of cattle all told, and in 1918, 12,311,140—an increase in 1918 over 1914 of nearly 130,000 head. These figures were taken from the report of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries.

I want especially to have the membership note the statement in reference to the maintenance of price. I now quote from the Bureau of Markets of date June 19, 1919:

The foregoing schedule if maintained will mean that the prices for home-dressed beef will have to be controlled until October or November, 1919, and that the price of such beef will have to be maintained at a fairly high average until the fixed live-weight prices are discontinued. It would appear that there will be difficulty in doing this if the plans materialize for obtaining the beef from Australasia and Argentina, to be sold at a lower price than that from the United States. There is a preference for home-dressed beef, but there is a question whether this preference will be sufficient to maintain the high price if other beef can be obtained at considerably lower prices.

This is the statement of the authority of Britain on the maintenance of price, and the fear is expressed that the price will break if they permit imports from Argentina and Australasia at a less price than paid to us. Now, while we want a good price for our surplus goods, we must not overlook the dangers of prohibitive cost to our own people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for one minute more.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time is in the control of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN].

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield one minute more to the gentleman.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, the statement I wanted to conclude is that while we want the best price that is reasonable for our exports, yet if the export price determines the cost of living here, and the Government is regulating that price, it immediately becomes a question whether our Government is regulating the price in the interest of the consumer as well as it is in the interest of the dealers in meat products. With live stock, especially cattle, abundant in the United Kingdom, still we are called upon to feed Europe, and in a sense to restrict our own consumption, and in that you have at least a partial explanation of the tremendous scale of prices of meats. And I say again, we must take care of our own consumption, and then we can look after the foreign consumption.

In the meantime we must endeavor to solve the question of the high level of cost. We are assured by cattle growers that the cost of feeding cattle is so high that the producer does not realize a profit. I am informed by people in whom I have confidence that feed and labor have become so expensive that the cattle raiser gets no advantage of the excessive high price charged the consumer. This situation enlists an interest of the Government in an attempt to get at the bottom of the real situation. It is a function of the Government which ought to be concerned about the rapidly scaling price of necessities.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JOHN W. RAINY].



Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess], who has just spoken, the other day when I was on the floor asked me if I was familiar with the amount of meat that was in cold storage at that time. I told him I was not, but since then I have an analysis of the Bureau of Markets' report of cold-storage holdings of frozen and cured meats on June 1, 1919. At that time there was 1,348,000,000 pounds of beef in storage. Now, the impression is had from readers of these reports that these stocks of meat are ready for market and are withheld from trade channels to maintain or advance present prices. That impression is wrong. The facts are that approximately 65 per cent of the meats reported consist of products in process of curing, that must remain in pickle or salt for a period of 30 to 60 days before available for the smokehouse or for shipment as cured meats.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. I will.

Mr. ANDERSON. The gentleman is referring to pork products?

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. I am referring to frozen beef, frozen lamb, mutton, and other meats, salted, smoked, pickled, frozen or unfrozen, and so forth.

Mr. ANDERSON. The general statement the gentleman has just made that all these products must be in storage for 30 to 60 days can not be true.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. Sixty-five per cent of the pork.

Mr. ANDERSON. It may be true as to pork.

Mr. EVANS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. Yes.

Mr. EVANS of Nebraska. Does the gentleman know the relative amounts as of date June 1 this year and June 1, 1914?

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. No; I do not.

Mr. EVANS of Nebraska. That would be a good illustration.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. Ten per cent consists of frozen pork, which later on must be put through the curing processes. Six per cent represents a fairly normal stock of lard, and considering the fact that a goodly portion of that must find its way to Europe, the remaining 19 per cent—

Mr. HAUGEN. Was the gentleman referring to meat that was contracted for for delivery?

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. No, sir. This was 1,348,000,000 pounds in storage.

The remaining 19 per cent consists of frozen beef and mutton put away mainly for overseas shipment. Even if the 165,000,000 pounds of beef and mutton were available for and wanted by the domestic trade, the quantity would be of little consequence, as it amounts to only 1½ pounds per capita.

The latest available Government figures give the per capita consumption of meat as 193½ pounds. At this rate the total consumption of meat in the United States is 20,000,000,000 pounds, of which the stock on hand reported by the Bureau of Markets on June 1 represents only 7 per cent.

Few people realize that it requires an output of 75,000,000 pounds of meat each working day in the year to supply domestic and export demands, and only 10 per cent of that is for export.

Even if the reported 1,348,000,000 pounds were promptly available and restricted to domestic consumption, the stock would last only 20 days.

It therefore should be clear from the foregoing analysis that meats are not being hoarded, but that the stocks reported represent a necessary supply because of the time required in preparation and to assure the consuming public a steady flow of finished meats.

The following is the Bureau of Markets report of cold-storage holdings of frozen and cured meats, June 1, 1919:

	Pounds.
Frozen beef	158,000,000
Cured beef	26,000,000
Frozen lamb and mutton	7,000,000
Frozen pork	143,000,000
Dry salted pork	398,000,000
Pickled pork	437,000,000
Lard	83,000,000
Miscellaneous	96,000,000
Total	1,348,000,000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, since the beginning of this session of Congress the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] has insisted upon reading into the Record a series of statements which are

calculated, without having it on their face, as a criticism of the administration. The gentleman has been complaining about the high cost of living. The gentleman is a student of political economy. He was a student before he came here. He has learned much since he got here.

I want to say this, and I think the gentleman will agree with me, that the factors now entering into the cost of living are well-known factors to students of political economy. They are, first, the high cost of labor, the high cost of production—and that is a more comprehensive term—and, second, the profit which the producer is demanding, and, third, the fact that the whole world is on an inflated currency basis. The value of a dollar is not much more in this country now than 50 cents was as compared with prewar conditions. It is hardly worth that much.

Now, the gentleman from Ohio drives himself to either one of two conclusions: Either he is not willing that labor shall be paid for the sweat of its brow or that the farmer who produces the raw material shall not have a just and reasonable profit for the sweat of his brow.

I want to say to you, gentlemen, when a new vision has taken possession of the world, when men no longer are going to sell their muscle and their brawn for a mere pittance, labor is going to demand a living wage; that labor is going to contend that it is not a commodity to be kicked around, but that it has rights on the face of this earth; that labor has a right to decent hours of work, and that labor has a right to an income sufficient to educate its children and put them into the battle of life on an equality with other folks.

And another new vision has come. The farmers of this country have reached the conclusion, because they have tasted the blood, that they are no longer going to sell the sweat of their brows for a mere song. They are no longer going to permit their children to work from early morn until late at night producing the things that men eat and wear at a mere pittance of a living. They are going to demand more than a living. They are going to demand an actual income, such as other classes of people have; and the gentleman from Ohio, when he continues to criticize the situation as it exists, drives himself either to one of two conclusions: That we shall reduce the wages of men who work or the profits of farmers who produce, or else that he does not understand what he is talking about. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN], to recede to the disagreement to Senate amendment No. 13 and concur with an amendment.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the last two votes taken and to lay that motion on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for a further conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent for a further conference with the Senate. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, before that consent is granted I want to draw the attention of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] to one fact that has just been brought to my attention, and that is that a Senate amendment—No. 40, page 53—has been inserted—

For investigating the handling, grading, packing, canning, freezing, storing, and transportation of fish, shrimp, oysters, and other shellfish, and for experimental shipments of fish, for the utilization of waste products, and the development of new sources of food, \$20,000.

And in that connection, so that the gentleman may be informed, I draw his attention to the sundry civil bill, recently passed by the House and now on the other side, in which, on page 148, appears this item:

Propagation of food fishes: For maintenance, equipment, and operations of fish-cultural stations, general propagation of food fishes and their distribution, including movement, maintenance, and repairs of cars, purchase of equipment and apparatus, contingent expenses, temporary labor, and not to exceed \$10,000 for propagation and distribution of fresh-water mussels and the necessary expenses connected therewith, \$400,000.

This may not be a duplication, but certainly it is an overlapping of authority in two departments, one in the Bureau of Fisheries in the Department of Commerce and the other in the Bureau of Chemistry in the Department of Agriculture. I call the attention of the gentleman from Iowa to this matter, so that some adjustment may be had, if possible.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] asks unanimous consent for a further conference with the Senate. Is there objection?

There was no objection; and the Speaker pro tempore appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. HAUGEN, Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan, and Mr. LEVER.

Mr. ROGERS rose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from Massachusetts rise?

Mr. ROGERS. I rise to ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, a year ago at this time Congress passed a resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to issue for a period of one year revocable permits to manufacturers along the Niagara River for the diversion of the water in connection with the industries there. The time expires next Monday, the 30th of June. If the legislation is not continued, it will mean the closing down of the industries along the bank of the Niagara River. The Secretary of War has asked Congress to pass a continuing resolution. Such a resolution has already passed the Senate, and a similar resolution has been reported from the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House this morning. In view of the urgency of the matter I ask unanimous consent that to-morrow morning, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and of conference reports, it be in order to take up House joint resolution 139, which I think I may safely say will not provoke any extended discussion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that to-morrow morning, after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and the disposition of pending conference reports, it shall be in order to take up for consideration House joint resolution 139. Is there objection?

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I had a conference with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] with reference to this resolution last evening, and we reached an understanding that in view of the fact that it is proposed to extend the existing terms for one year I would not interpose any objection on the ground that the subject matter of the resolution might be in conflict with the jurisdiction of the general Water Power Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. WINGO. Reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts how often these extensions have been granted?

Mr. ROGERS. The first legislation authorizing these permits was passed in January, 1917. There have been two since that time, and this is the fourth, if my recollection is correct. May I add, however, that this legislation is expressly framed so as to expire automatically when the general water-power legislation becomes law; and I presume that most of us expect that that law will become effective within a very few months. Thereupon this temporary legislation will automatically go out of existence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WINGO. Just a moment. Ever since I have been a Member of the House this Niagara Falls problem has been before Congress in one shape or another. Extensions have been granted, first on one proposition and then on another, with the promise repeatedly made, certainly with reference to that class of legislation that is within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, that that committee would bring in some bill. I have talked with older Members who have been here 10 or 15 years longer than I have, and they say this question started before they came here. Can the gentleman give us any assurance that legislation will be taken up that will permanently settle that problem?

Mr. ROGERS. It is the special order of the House that general water-power legislation be taken up to-day.

I now ask unanimous consent that this resolution be in order to-morrow morning after business on the Speaker's desk has been disposed of.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that House joint resolution 139 be made in order to-morrow morning after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and of conference reports. Is there objection?

Mr. WINGO. Reserving the right to object, I am not sure at the moment whether the general water-power bill will settle all these controversies with reference to Niagara Falls or not. It occurs to me that there was some exception with reference to that, was there not?

Mr. ROGERS. The water-power bill as reported by the Special Committee on Water Power is universal in its terms, and I suppose that as it stands it will be broad enough to cover Niagara Falls and all other boundary streams.

Mr. WINGO. Did not the water-power bill that passed in the last Congress have an exception with reference to Niagara Falls?

Mr. ROGERS. The Special Water Power Committee created a year and a half ago had expressly excluded from its jurisdiction all legislation with reference to Niagara Falls; but the Special Water Power Committee created on the 22d of May of this year received broader powers; Niagara Falls is not excepted from its jurisdiction, nor are any other boundary or other streams.

Mr. WINGO. I shall not object; but while I hope I shall be permitted to stay in Congress a great many years, I also hope that this question will be settled before I leave Congress. [Laughter.]

Mr. FULLER of Illinois. Reserving the right to object, under the rules of the House to-morrow is pension day, and I desire at that time to call up an omnibus pension bill that is on the calendar. We would not like to be deprived of the opportunity to do that.

Mr. ROGERS. Let me suggest to the gentleman from Illinois that this Niagara Falls bill has been up two or three times and never evoked any long discussion. This measure being identical in its terms with the bill passed a year ago, I think it will not delay the consideration of the bill which the gentleman desires to call up.

Mr. FULLER of Illinois. I shall not object, but at the close of this business I shall call up the pension bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. LEVER. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on the conference report on the Agricultural bill.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. I make a similar request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY] ask unanimous consent to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report on the Agricultural appropriation bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4226) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota calls up the conference report on H. R. 4226, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4226) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 9, 10, 11, 36, 37, 40, 42, 46, 51, 53, 55, 56, 69, 71, 72, 73, 74, 87, 89, 97, 97½, 104, 105, 109, 110, 119, 120, 121, and 132.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 5, 7, 8, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 26, 27, 32, 33, 35, 39, 41, 43, 47, 49, 50, 52, 59, 65, 68, 70, 78, 81, 82, 83, 96, 101, 103, 106, 107, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 117, 118, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, and 133, and agree to the same.

Amendments numbered 1 and 45: The committee of conference has been unable to agree on the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 45.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and



agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$124,490"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$50,820"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 3 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the word "statistical" and insert in lieu thereof the word "chief"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$780"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$660"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$660"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "one \$840, one \$780, two at \$660 each"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$780"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "six at \$660 each, five at \$600 each"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$660"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$68,560"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$6,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$454,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"The assessment of costs against abutting property on account of the construction in November, 1918, of a concrete roadway on Howard Road for a distance of 1,600 feet west from Nichols Avenue, may be postponed, in the discretion of

the commissioners, for not to exceed one year from the date of the approval of this act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$4,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after the word "employee," insert the word "heretofore"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,060"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$860"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$860"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 63: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$860"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,925,260"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$30,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 75: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 4 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "\$2,500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,800," and in line 6 strike out "\$12,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$10,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 76: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$2,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 77: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 79: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 79, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 1 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the words "the complete," and in line 2 strike out the sum "\$50,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$25,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 80: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"For payment of necessary expenses connected with the organization and conducting of community forums and civic

centers in school buildings, including equipment, fixtures, and supplies for lighting and equipping the buildings, payment of janitor service, secretaries, teachers, organizers, and clerks, and employees of the day schools may also be employees of the community forums and civic centers, \$25,000: *Provided*, That not more than 20 per cent of this sum shall be expended for payment of secretaries, teachers, organizers, and clerks."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert "fifty-six"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 85: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert "two hundred and twenty-five"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 86: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert "nine"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 88: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,272,680"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 90: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$660"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 91: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$660"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 92: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$17,340"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 93: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$660"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 94: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 94, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$5,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 95: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$8,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 98: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 98, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert "ten"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 99: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 99, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert "three"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 100: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 100, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$89,790"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 102: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 102, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 1 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the sum "\$2,500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,000," and in line 3 strike out the sum "\$3,100" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 108: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 108, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$28,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 116: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 116, and

agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "For repairing the elevators in the Central Dispensary and Emergency Hospital, \$1,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 134: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 134, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all of the matter inserted by said amendment after the figures "1916," in line 10, and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"Such compensation as the commission provided for in said act may award to employees of the government of the District of Columbia shall be paid in the manner provided by law for the payment of the general expenses of the government of the District of Columbia. For carrying out the provisions of this section there is appropriated \$5,000; and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall submit annually to Congress, through the Secretary of the Treasury, estimates of appropriations necessary for the foregoing purpose."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 135: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 135, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out lines 16 to 20, inclusive, of the matter inserted by said amendment, and in lines 13 and 15 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the word "act" and insert in lieu thereof the word "section"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 136: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 136, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 13. That the provisions of the joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution to prevent rent profiteering in the District of Columbia,' approved May 31, 1918, are extended and continued in full force and effect for a period of 90 days following the definite conclusion of a treaty of peace between the United States and the Imperial German Government."

And the Senate agree to the same.

C. R. DAVIS,  
LOUIS C. CRAMTON,  
J. P. BUCHANAN,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

CHARLES CURTIS,  
LAWRENCE Y. SHERMAN,  
JOHN WALTER SMITH,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

#### STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4226) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report as to each of said amendments, namely:

On No. 1: The committee of conference have been unable to agree on the amendment No. 1, which relates to the half-and-half method of appropriating for the District of Columbia.

On No. 2: Increases the pay of the veterinary surgeon from \$1,200 to \$1,400, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 3: Strikes out the increase of \$200 proposed in the pay of the storekeeper in the purchasing division.

On No. 4: Appropriates \$1,600, instead of \$1,500 as proposed by the House and \$1,800 as proposed by the Senate, for temporary inspectors in the building-inspection division.

On No. 5: Inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, authorizing the commissioners to impose fees for all inspections or services to be performed by any public officer or employee of the District of Columbia.

On No. 6: Corrects a total in the bill.

On Nos. 7 and 8: Appropriates \$900 for a storekeeper in connection with the care of the District Building.

On Nos. 9 and 10: Strikes out the additional inspector at \$1,200, proposed by the Senate, in the license bureau.

On Nos. 11, 12, and 13, relating to the collector's office: Provides for two additional clerks at \$1,200 each, and strikes out the additional bailiff at \$1,200.

On Nos. 14 and 15: Appropriates \$1,500, as proposed by the Senate, for a seventh assistant corporation counsel.

On Nos. 16, 17, and 18, relating to the Public Utilities Commission: Appropriates for employees in detail, as proposed by the Senate, instead of under a lump sum, as proposed by the House, and reduces the appropriation for incidental expenses



from \$20,000, as proposed by the House, to \$10,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 19 and 20: Increases from \$300 to \$600, as proposed by the Senate, the amount for temporary clerk hire in the department of insurance.

On Nos. 21 to 31, inclusive, relating to the Public Library: Increases the pay of seven assistants from \$840 to \$900 each; appropriates for seven assistants at \$780 each instead of \$720, as proposed by the House, and \$840, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates for six assistants at \$660 each instead of \$600, as proposed by the House, and \$720, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$660 for a copyist instead of \$600, as proposed by the House, and \$720, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$780 for a cataloguer instead of \$720, as proposed by the House, and \$840, as proposed by the Senate; provides for two cataloguers at \$660 each instead of at \$600, as proposed by the House, and \$840, as proposed by the Senate; increases the pay of one stenographer from \$900 to \$1,000 and another stenographer from \$720 to \$840, as proposed by the Senate; fixes the pay of one attendant at \$780 instead of \$720, as proposed by the House, and \$900, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates for six attendants at \$660 each instead of \$600 each, as proposed by the House, and \$720 each, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates for five attendants at \$600 each instead of \$540 each, as proposed by the House, and \$720 each, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates for a collator at \$660 instead of \$600, as proposed by the House, and \$720, as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 32 and 33: Inserts the language, proposed by the Senate, providing for the maintenance of telephones in the residences of the assistant superintendent of the street-cleaning division and the chief of the bureau of preventable diseases.

On No. 34: Appropriates \$6,000 instead of \$5,000 as proposed by the House, and \$6,225 as proposed by the Senate, for contingent expenses of the coroner's office.

On No. 35: Appropriates \$6,000, as proposed by the Senate, for rent of offices for the recorder of deeds.

On No. 36: Reappropriates an unexpended balance for repair of buildings when injured by fire, as proposed by the House, instead of appropriating \$10,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 37: Strikes out the appropriation of \$2,000 for lithographing and binding office maps in the office of the assessor.

On No. 38: Appropriates \$200,000, instead of \$150,000 as proposed by the House, and \$220,000 as proposed by the Senate, for assessment and permit work on streets.

On Nos. 39 to 44, inclusive, relating to street improvements: Inserts the following appropriations: Thirty-three thousand dollars for paving Euclid Street NW., \$122,000 for paving Georgia Avenue NW., \$17,000 for paving Eleventh Street NW., and strikes out the following appropriations: Thirty-nine thousand dollars for improving Connecticut Avenue from Pierce Mill Road to Chappell Road NW., and \$136,000 for paving Connecticut Avenue from Chappell Road to Chevy Chase Circle NW.

On No. 45: The committee of conference have been unable to agree on the appropriation of \$3,820 to pay Thomas W. and Alice N. Keller for ground taken and damages on account of condemnation proceedings.

On No. 46: Appropriates \$40,000, as proposed by the House, for the opening, extension, or widening of streets.

On No. 47: Appropriates \$20,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$10,000, as proposed by the House, for sidewalks and curbs around public and municipal buildings and reservations.

On No. 48: Inserts a substitute for the amendment proposed by the Senate, postponing for not to exceed one year the assessment of costs against abutting property on account of the construction of a concrete roadway on Howard Road.

On Nos. 49, 50, and 51, relating to the sewer department: Inserts the authority, proposed by the Senate, for the purchase of a motor field wagon; reappropriates the unexpended balance of the appropriation for suburban sewers for 1917, as proposed by the Senate; and continues available during the fiscal year 1920 the appropriations for sewer-construction work for the fiscal year 1919.

On Nos. 52 and 53: Appropriates \$656,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$621,000, as proposed by the House, for the collection and disposal of city refuse, and restores the limitation, stricken out by the Senate, covering into the Treasury any proceeds received from the disposal of city refuse and garbage.

On Nos. 54, 55, and 56, relating to the electrical department: Appropriates \$4,000, instead of \$3,500 as proposed by the House and \$5,000 as proposed by the Senate, for placing wires underground; strikes out the increase of \$1,000, proposed by the

Senate, in the appropriation for extension and relocation of police-patrol system; and strikes out the increase of \$1,000, proposed by the Senate, in the appropriation for extension and relocation of the fire-alarm system.

On Nos. 57 to 81, inclusive, relating to the public schools: Inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, preserving the status of an employee heretofore transferred to the position of assistant principal of the Central High School; fixes the compensation of teachers in Group A of class 6 at \$1,060, instead of \$1,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,200 as proposed by the Senate; fixes the compensation of teachers in class 5 at \$1,000 each as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$950 each as proposed by the House; fixes the compensation of teachers in class 4 at \$900 each, instead of \$850 each as proposed by the House and \$1,000 each as proposed by the Senate; fixes the compensation of teachers in classes 1, 2, and 3 at \$860 each, instead of \$800 each as proposed by the House and \$1,000 as proposed by the Senate; fixes the compensation of 10 librarians in class 5 at \$900 each, instead of \$840 each as proposed by the House and \$1,000 each as proposed by the Senate; makes provision for school playgrounds during the vacation, as proposed by the Senate; strikes out the provision for directors and officers in connection with vacation schools and playgrounds; strikes out the provision, proposed by the Senate, for school officers in connection with the maintenance of night schools; appropriates \$12,500 for Americanization work in the public schools, instead of \$15,000 as proposed by the Senate, and makes provision for a principal at \$1,800, instead of \$2,500 as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$200,000, instead of \$210,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$190,000 as proposed by the House for repairs and improvements in school buildings and grounds; inserts the authority, proposed by the Senate, granting an allowance to the chief medical and sanitary inspector of schools for the maintenance of a motor or horse-drawn vehicle; appropriates \$25,000, instead of \$50,000 as proposed by the Senate, for the equipment of a machine shop in the new Central High School; appropriates \$25,000, instead of \$30,000 as proposed by the House, for expenses of conducting community forums and civic centers, modified so as to limit the expenditures for payment of secretaries, teachers, organizers, and clerks to not more than 20 per cent of the appropriation; and strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the paragraph authorizing the use of floor and room space in the Franklin school building for office purposes.

On Nos. 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, and 89 relating to the metropolitan police: Provides for an additional captain at \$2,000 and additional lieutenant at \$1,600, as proposed by the Senate; provides for 56 sergeants at \$1,400 each, instead of 54 as proposed by the House and 57 as proposed by the Senate; provides for 225 privates at \$1,080 each, instead of 187 privates as proposed by the House and 237 privates as proposed by the Senate; provides for 9 telephone clerks at \$900 each, instead of 8 as proposed by the House and 10 as proposed by the Senate; strikes out the 5 additional drivers at \$900 each, proposed by the Senate; and strikes out the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, authorizing the War Department to transfer to the commissioners, such ordnance and worn motor, mounted, or other equipment as may be required, and restores the paragraph, proposed by the House, limiting the authority of transfer to worn mounted equipment.

On Nos. 90, 91, and 92, relating to the House of Detention: Fixes the pay of 6 guards and a janitor at \$660 each, instead of \$600 each as proposed by the House and \$720 as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 93, 94, and 95, relating to the harbor patrol: Fixes the pay of 2 firemen, 1 watchman, and 2 deckhands at \$660 each, instead of \$600 as proposed by the House and \$720 as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 96, 97, and 97½, relating to the fire department: Inserts the authority, proposed by the Senate, for the installation and maintenance of telephones in the residences of the superintendent of machinery and the fire marshal; and strikes out the appropriation of \$10,368 for a concrete and frame drill tower.

On Nos. 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, and 103, relating to the health department: Provides for 10 sanitary inspectors at \$1,200 each, instead of 9 as proposed by the House and 12 as proposed by the Senate; appropriates for 3 food inspectors at \$1,400 each, instead of 2 as proposed by the House, and 4 as proposed by the Senate; increases the sum for maintenance of a motor vehicle in the pound service from \$360 to \$600; appropriates \$2,600, instead of \$3,100 as proposed by the Senate, for the purchase and maintenance of a motor ambulance; and appropriates \$15,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the Washington diet kitchen.

On No. 104: Strikes out the appropriations of \$25,000 each toward the maintenance of the schools of medicine and dentistry and the hospitals, of the Georgetown and George Washington Universities.

On No. 105: Strikes out the increase of \$2,000, proposed by the Senate, in the appropriation for the emergency fund.

On Nos. 106 and 107: Provides for an electrician at \$900, as proposed by the Senate, for the courthouse of the District of Columbia.

On No. 108: Appropriates \$28,400, instead of \$27,200 as proposed by the House and \$29,600 as proposed by the Senate, for the pay of bailiffs in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia.

On Nos. 109 and 110: Strikes out the appropriation of \$2,600 for the purchase and maintenance of an additional ambulance for the Board of Charities.

On Nos. 111, 112, and 113, relating to the Washington Asylum and Jail: Appropriates \$350, as proposed by the Senate, for the purchase of apparatus for the operating room, and appropriates \$2,500, as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,000 as proposed by the House, for the transportation of prisoners.

On Nos. 114 and 115: Appropriates \$13,000, as proposed by the Senate, for an additional amount for the extension of the colored women's ward at the Home for the Aged and Infirm.

On No. 116: Appropriates \$1,500 for repairing the elevators in the Central Dispensary and Emergency Hospital, instead of \$22,000, as proposed by the Senate, for repairs and the purchase and installation of a new elevator.

On Nos. 117 and 118: Increases the appropriation for repairs and improvements to buildings and grounds at the tuberculosis hospital from \$2,000 to \$2,500, as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 119, 120, and 121: Strikes out the increase of \$200 proposed by the Senate in the pay of the agent in the Board of Children's Guardians.

On Nos. 122 and 123: Appropriates \$5,000 and \$1,500, respectively, as proposed by the Senate, for the National Library for the Blind and Columbia Polytechnic Institute.

On Nos. 124, 125, and 126: Reduces the compensation of the assistant superintendent of the reformatory from \$2,000 to \$1,800, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 127: Inserts the paragraph proposed by the Senate authorizing the Secretary of War, in connection with the reclamation and development of the Anacostia Park, to take immediate possession of lands against which condemnation proceedings have been instituted and to proceed with such public works thereon as have been authorized by Congress.

On Nos. 128 and 129: Increases the compensation of the chief steam engineer in the water department from \$1,750 to \$1,800, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 130: Appropriates \$450,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$400,000 as proposed by the House, for the extension of the water-distribution system.

On No. 131: Appropriates \$9,600, as proposed by the Senate, for the installation of water meters in United States buildings, reservations, or grounds in the District of Columbia.

On No. 132: Strikes out the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, requiring payment by the Government of the United States and the government of the District of Columbia for all water used by them.

On No. 133: Inserts the paragraph proposed by the Senate requiring the officials of the District of Columbia, when purchasing materials, supplies, and equipment from sources other than the Government of the United States, to show affirmatively that they were unable to procure the same from the United States.

On No. 134: Inserts the section, proposed by the Senate, extending the benefits of the United States employees-compensation act to the employees of the government of the District of Columbia, modified so as to eliminate the provision for a permanent fund for the payment thereof, and to require annual estimates of appropriations for the amount necessary to make payments under the section.

On No. 135: Inserts the section proposed by the Senate regulating the driving of public cabs and public vehicles, modified so as to eliminate the second paragraph of the section describing what constitutes loitering.

On No. 136: Inserts a substitute for section 13 providing for the extension of the so-called Saulsbury resolution for a period of 90 days from the date of the definite conclusion of a treaty of peace.

C. R. DAVIS,  
LOUIS C. CRAMTON,  
J. P. BUCHANAN,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota if he will consume his hour. I presume there are a great many matters the gentleman will wish to explain.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Does the gentleman mean a great many matters that he wishes me to explain to him or that I want to explain?

Mr. Sisson. That the gentleman will want to explain.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. No; I will not use the whole hour.

Mr. Sisson. I hope the gentleman will not move the previous question until a reasonable time is given for debate. I want to congratulate my friend and the conferees on the part of the House on the result of the conference.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I will take at this time very little of the time of the House to explain this bill. No doubt but that on account of the great number of items contained in it and the conflict of views that exist between the Senate and the House there will be many Members on the floor who will desire to be heard on some of them. While I am very desirous of getting this matter to a close as speedily as possible, I will be as lenient as possible.

I will say, in the first instance, that this bill as it passed the House carried \$14,780,981. The bill as passed by the Senate carried \$15,944,954, an increase of \$1,163,973.

The conferees, well knowing the desire of the House, I think on both sides, and the country at large, that economy should be practiced wherever practicable, and yet in no instance to practice economy to the great detriment of the public, were animated by that spirit. I will say now that the bill carries about one-half of the increase proposed by the Senate, and the Senate receded from the other half. In round figures the amount which the Senate receded from was \$576,613, and the amount that the House conceded was \$586,440.

The conferees have come to a full agreement, and to our minds as satisfactorily as it possibly can be done if we were to sit for months on all the items in the bill except two. Those two items are the half and half and the Keller item of \$3,800. Those are the only two items that the conferees are unable to agree upon.

When I get through I am going to ask the House to grant a further conference on these two items. I am aware that there are many Members present who desire to be heard, especially upon the half-and-half amendment. I hardly think there are any here who will care to be heard on the Keller proposition. That is a matter this House has definitely settled for a great many years.

I will not at this time say anything concerning the two items in disagreement, and if the gentleman from Mississippi wants a little time I am willing to yield him 10 or 15 minutes.

Mr. Sisson. I did not know but that the gentleman might make some explanation as to the agreements that have been reached with the Senate conferees.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will answer any question that I can concerning these items which the gentleman from Mississippi and I disagree upon.

Mr. Sisson. There is one item that involves a good deal of money, and those are the amendments 57 to 81, where the basic salary of the school-teachers has been changed from a thousand dollars, class 6, to \$1,060, and \$1,200 proposed by the Senate. They voted for \$1,200 and the conferees agreed on \$1,060. Then the basic pay of the teachers going from that down to the first class, as ratified under the longevity law, makes the lowest salary for entrance into the school at \$860. Is that correct?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Eight hundred and sixty dollars; yes.

Mr. Sisson. Plus the \$240 would make \$1,100 as the lowest salary?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Yes; that is the lowest.

Mr. Sisson. That would be the first year of a teacher in the District of Columbia?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. That is as I understand it.

Mr. Sisson. Does the change in classification by this language change the amount of longevity pay?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I do not think it does.

Mr. Sisson. Then the teacher who receives \$500 under the original act would get \$25 longevity for each year for 10 years? Those in the grade above, as I recall, get \$50?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. No; \$30. They get \$25 and then \$30 and up to \$40 before they get \$50. I investigated that thoroughly and found that to be true.

Mr. Sisson. The highest longevity under the organic act in the grades was \$50 a year, up until you got to the high school, where it commenced at \$100?



Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Yes; but between the \$50 and the lowest grade it ran down 40, 30, and 25, and that is the law to-day.

Mr. Sisson. The longevity law?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The longevity law.

Mr. Sisson. So the overwhelming majority of the teachers in the District of Columbia have taught a good deal more than two or three years. Some of them have been here a good many years and get the highest longevity pay. With the base pay ranging from \$860 in these grades to \$1,060, it will make the salaries of the teachers in that grade higher than in any city in the United States in those grades.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The gentleman states that and I am not prepared to contradict him.

Mr. Sisson. My investigation shows that the city of Boston paid the highest salary in the graded schools, and this is a little above that. What I wanted to get at is this: Has Congress any reasonable assurance that our friends will now be satisfied with this very radical increase. The gentleman and I increase the salaries from \$500 to \$750. Then the House increased the salary to \$800, and now we have increased it \$60, and in addition to that we increased the bonus from \$120 to \$240. That has all been done within 12 months.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I think that is a matter of history.

Mr. Sisson. Will we then have to confront again a demand for higher pay, or will our friends be satisfied with a very liberal allowance which we are making them in this bill?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will refer the gentleman to the school board of the District, to the superintendent of schools.

Mr. Sisson. I am sure my friend will remain in Congress a long time if he lives, and I trust that he will live a long time.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Sisson. If the gentleman will say that so far as he is concerned, at least for the immediate future, he feels we have done for the teachers in the District of Columbia all that ought to be done reasonably, that might have a very great tendency toward preventing a demand next year for a still higher rate.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I would say to the gentleman that if he had propounded that question to me five or six years ago, before the World War started, I would have answered him in the affirmative. He wants me now to pledge myself in advance. I would say to the gentleman it may depend wholly upon what occurs across the water after peace is declared, after the league of nations has been adopted, and so forth. It is a matter that I can not pledge myself to now, because I do not know, and I do not think the gentleman knows, what is going to occur in the next six months or the next two or three years.

Mr. Sisson. With the present conditions which surround us, if the salaries should be lowered in all of the other departments of the Government, and in activities outside of the Government, if the States should find it necessary to curtail, we certainly ought not to be putting ourselves in the attitude of inviting further increases.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. And the gentleman might add further to that, if the cost of living be cut in two and rents be reduced one-half. Then I might be in a better position to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, that is all the time of the gentleman that I care to take, if he will yield to me further when he concludes.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. In a moment. I wish to say that the principal increase in this bill comes from four or five items. Since the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] has suggested it, I might state that the Senate requested an increase in the teachers' salaries of \$347,000 more than contained in the bill that failed March 4 last. That was the increase that the Senate proposed. Of that increase we granted, in round numbers, \$111,500. We refused to grant, so far as the report is concerned, \$236,140. One of the main increases in the bill is the \$111,560, the increase in the pay of the teachers. The next largest item, perhaps the largest, is the item on streets. Your committee after hearing the Senate and conferring with them concluded that the amount of improvement for streets, and so forth, should be increased by \$172,000 more than the original bill. The Senate wanted \$175,000 in addition to that. We met them pretty nearly half way, and that is a very large increase. Again, we increased the amount for extension of a water plant from \$400,000 to \$450,000. Those three items alone account for over one-half of the increase that was brought into the bill since you gentlemen voted on it before.

Mr. Sisson. Amendment No. 131 provides for \$9,600 for metering the Government buildings. Did that item go out?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. We have left \$9,600 in there for metering the Government buildings, but we cut out any and all propositions pertaining to the Government's paying for its water, leaving that for future Congresses to determine. We

have allowed \$9,600 a year for the purpose of metering these buildings, chiefly to ascertain who is wasting the water in the Government buildings, if any be wasted, not for the purpose of making the Government pay for it unless a future Congress should so determine. A good many of the Government buildings have already been metered.

Mr. Sisson. We quit the policy of metering the buildings because, first, of the expense attached to it, and, second, because the Government having owned its water plant should get its own supply of water. The Government having built the plant, of course it should use its own water. I have no objection to stopping waste, and I think that ought to be done, but I am afraid that they are endeavoring to make a showing and they claim that the Government ought to pay more for the water, so as not to increase the rates in the city.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the chairman it might be well for him to state that the Senate conferees said that hearings show a great waste of water in certain Government buildings, an unnecessary waste, and the only way to determine that fact was to put meters on so as to check it up in that way, otherwise the city would fail in its water supply.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The gentleman from Texas is correct.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is why we agreed to put the meters on.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson].

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I am not going to argue in extenso because I believe that the Members of the House understand the items in disagreement.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Mississippi suspend for just a moment for me to submit a unanimous-consent request, not to be taken out of the gentleman's time?

Mr. Sisson. I will.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the enrolling clerk of the House be authorized to modify the part of the substitute of the gentleman from Iowa to amendment No. 13 of the Senate to the Agricultural appropriation bill relating to the lines and pages of the bill so that the amendment will conform to the engrossed bill. I make that request because of the fact that in his reference to lines and pages in offering his amendment he referred to the printed bill with the Senate amendments and not to the enrolled bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that the enrolling clerk of the House be authorized to modify the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] to the amendment of the Senate to the Agricultural bill so as to conform to the engrossed bill in respect to lines and pages. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Speaker, as I started to state a moment ago, I do not think it is necessary to discuss the half and half as to its being a fair and a just system of taxation in the District of Columbia, because the House has too repeatedly overwhelmingly voted against it. I do not think it is going to be contended at any source except one small body of men that it is tenable. Everybody that has ever investigated the matter at once decided that it is not tenable, but I understand there is some question on the part of some people in the city as to the accuracy of some figures which I gave the committee in a speech I made the other day in reference to taxation. I want the Record to show that the figures which I put in the Record were taken from letters in answer to letters which I wrote to the city authorities in nearly all the cities, and the tax collector or tax assessor, whose duty it is to possess the particular information that I wanted, wrote me letters giving that information, and that information was obtained just before the close of the last session of Congress, so I have in my judgment the most accurate and the latest information as to the rate of taxation—later than that of the Census Department. The last statement that I got from the Census Department was the report in 1917, which did not give always the 1917 rates, but gave rates in 1916, so in order to bring it down to date I gave those facts. Now, the facts stated on pages 1628 and 1629 of the Record, where I give the per capita tax here and the per capita tax of the other cities, the per capita tax of the citizens of Washington was obtained by taking the total amount paid for the governmental expenses for that year by the taxpayer of the District of Columbia and dividing it by the population as shown by the latest census. And I believe those figures are as nearly correct as it is possible for statistics to show. Then everyone who wants to be fair will admit that the District of Columbia ought not to exempt choses in action, money in banks, and so forth, and after this statement was



made I concluded I would look at it from another angle and see whether property of the District of Columbia was assessed about as it is assessed in other cities, so if you will take the population of the District of Columbia and take the total assessment of the District of Columbia and the total assessment in other cities and look it over you will find by comparison it is about what you would expect it to be, showing that the assessment is about the same in cities of like size, but when it comes to a comparison of the amount of money paid into the respective treasuries of the States, counties, and cities, which includes choses in action and money in banks, you will find a great disparity between the amounts paid by the taxpayer in the District of Columbia and the amounts paid in the other cities.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas rose.

Mr. Sisson. So there is practically nothing collected from that source of revenue, and large amounts are collected in the other cities from that source. Therefore the people of great wealth come to the city of Washington in order that they may escape the taxation on their choses in action, as I stated in a speech which I made a day or two ago. I now yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Has the gentleman from Mississippi overlooked the fact that on the choses in action and other property of that character the citizens of Washington paid \$850,000 last year?

Mr. Sisson. Oh, no.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That is the fact.

Mr. Sisson. However, I will state to the gentleman, all of that \$800,000 was not paid absolutely on choses in action and money in banks. There are certain other personal property taxes included in that item, but the gentleman's figures are, I suppose, correct to that degree—

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. All that character of property.

Now, the gentleman says that more money is paid into the treasuries of other cities of like size than into the treasury of the District of Columbia. Does not the gentleman know that the District of Columbia has no source of revenue except such as she gets from the action of Congress?

Mr. Sisson. I am not blaming the District people. I am simply blaming a certain body not very far from this and a few men in this House for the attitude which they assume in reference to keeping on the statute books—

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The amount of money that goes into the treasury, for instance, of Detroit, Baltimore, or Kansas City, or much of it, may be from the sale of bonds, from licenses, and other sources.

Mr. Sisson. Oh, no.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Oh, yes.

Mr. Sisson. Oh, the gentleman says "Oh, yes." But the figures I give you eliminate the bond sales. It takes the annual budget.

There is not a city of 100,000 people or over in the United States where the rate of taxation is not more than double what it is in the District of Columbia. Now, there are some of the smaller cities where, when you confine their tax roll simply to the city tax—and that is the comparison that the friends of the half and half would make—it is only a little larger than the rate paid in the District of Columbia. But, mark you, those towns have to pay a county tax and a State tax on their city property. But that tax which those cities pay to maintain the county and to maintain the State is all merged into this one tax act in the District of Columbia. For instance, there are the suburban roads, which are kept up outside of the city proper. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Davis] and I have visited those roads, and have gone to the remote portion of the District where country roads are kept up, and where they actually maintain some little rural schools out there.

Mr. EVANS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Sisson. I will.

Mr. EVANS of Nebraska. I have in my hand a brief filed in 1916, and which gives the comparative tax rate between Washington and other cities, and which makes them nearly the same. Why this discrepancy between this brief and your statement?

Mr. Sisson. I wish to say that that is made by Mr. Noyes, who is the principal attorney for the half-and-half plan. The trouble with Mr. Noyes is—and I did not know the basis of his contention; I only saw the result—is that he has eliminated the county and State tax in all these cities.

That ought not to be done, because the tax for the courts, the ferries, the roads, the bridges, and schools would be paid in the cities outside of the District of Columbia, and go to support those institutions, including the nisi prius courts and

criminal courts, and so forth. And yet all that is covered in the District of Columbia, because we have only one unit here. I think that is the trouble with his figures, but I do not happen to know the source of his information. I only know that there comes to the desk of Members of Congress about the time this matter comes up a brief which was in the summer of 1916 filed with the joint commission of the two Houses, one of the dodges for the purpose of defeating the change of this system of taxation, because then they asked that this matter be heard before a joint commission that would go into all the facts, and the people of the District of Columbia had ample opportunity and for weeks went before that commission. And I have not seen any statement in that great volume of records that was not a statement made in favor of the people of the District of Columbia and the present system of taxation. Yet, notwithstanding there was practically an ex parte hearing, the three gentlemen on that commission on the part of the House and the three on the part of the Senate had consistently voted for the half and half. They had not investigated it, and yet that commission changed their mind, all six of them, and signed a unanimous report that the half and half could no longer be maintained in principle and that it had outlived the day of its usefulness.

There is another thing that ought to be said: At the time the half and half was placed upon the District in 1878 the District of Columbia had been run into debt and they had a perfect saturnalia of crime here in the peculiar city government they had, and money had been expended riotously, so much so that the actual indebtedness of the District of Columbia not covered by bonds was floating around, contractors had claims against the city, and the District was in frightful shape financially.

In that condition the joint commission was appointed, and the House at that time, my recollection is, was Democratic and the Senate Republican; and Mr. Blackburn, of Kentucky, who was afterwards in the Senate, was chairman of the committee in the House, and I believe Mr. Blaine—although I am not sure it was he—was on the commission in the Senate. They then discussed it, and at that time, my recollection is—and if I am incorrect about it somebody who has investigated it will tell me—they fixed a rate on the present valuation of property, which has not been changed since 1878, at  $1\frac{1}{2}$  per cent on two-thirds valuation, but they provided in that agreement, which is now the law, that the District of Columbia would only pay half of its expenses—and then the tax was 1 per cent on full—and also assumed the payment of \$44,000,000 of indebtedness which was ascertained to be due, and that included the then-existing bonded indebtedness, and what they called the floating indebtedness, for which no arrangement had been made to pay. And all the debts of the District were absorbed in this bond issue. The Federal Government issued what was known as the 3.65 bonds, wherein the Government told the bond purchasers that they would guarantee the payment of these bonds with the 3.65 interest, and from that day to this the Federal Government has been paying one-half of the indebtedness of the District of Columbia which was incurred by the District authorities when they had their own self-government here—one-half of the bonds with the interest—and at that time, mark you, not a sidewalk or street around a piece of property owned by the Federal Government was paid for out of any District fund, because that government was entirely separated from the Federal Treasury.

Now, I had not intended to go into that because I thought I had explained that before, but in view of the interrogatory of my friend I thought it necessary to explain that fully, so that there could be no misunderstanding of it.

Now, at that time they reduced the rate of taxation down to  $1\frac{1}{2}$  per cent on a two-thirds valuation, 1 per cent on a full valuation. So when other cities throughout the United States collect a certain per cent of tax on full valuation according to law the only thing necessary to compare their rates with the District is to ascertain whether or not they have made a fair assessment. If they have made a fair assessment, then the next question is whether or not their assessment has been made upon a basis which values the property according to the same rule, and about as it is valued in the District of Columbia. When you arrive at that basis you have then arrived at a basis where you can determine whether a man investing a dollar in Washington pays more or less taxation than he would pay on that same dollar invested in some other city.

Now, reducing it down to that basis as nearly as it is possible to do you will find that a man investing a dollar in property here, if he buys it at a reasonable price, would pay twice as much tax on property in other cities of the same size as he pays here. I want to congratulate the chairman of this committee and the conferees on their action, because I believe they have made a magnificent showing and made a splendid



fight, and the bill as agreed upon, except as to these two items, No. 1 and the Keller item, is as good as anybody could have obtained. I say I want to congratulate these conferees, and I think the House and the country ought to congratulate them on the good work that they have done.

Mr. STEPHENS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. Sisson. Yes.

Mr. STEPHENS of Ohio. As to the valuation of real estate in the District, is it valued at its actual market value?

Mr. Sisson. That is the law.

Mr. STEPHENS of Ohio. It is assessed at its actual market value?

Mr. Sisson. That is the law. I do not know whether it is done or not.

Mr. CRAMTON. It is assessed at two-thirds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. Sisson. I would like to have two minutes more.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, how much time has been consumed?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Thirty minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I would like to give the gentleman a little more time, but the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] wants 10 or 15 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] wants 10 or 15 minutes, and I want a few minutes myself.

Mr. Sisson. I do not want to consume any more time than is necessary, but I think that gentlemen who want to debate this matter should debate it.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I should hate to lose the advantage of this hour and have it run over to another hour.

Mr. Sisson. The gentleman realizes that it might take a great deal more time if an attempt is made to abridge debate. I think it will economize time to let it run a little.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. Sisson. Now, the property here is assessed at its full value, but the collection of taxes is made on a two-thirds value, and the rate is applied at  $1\frac{1}{2}$  per cent on a two-thirds value of the property.

Mr. STEPHENS of Ohio. Then is it the gentleman's opinion that it ought to be assessed on the full value?

Mr. Sisson. It is assessed at the full value, but the tax is collected on two-thirds value. I agree with the gentleman literally, because if they would assess it on its full value and collect the tax at its full value the tax rate in the District of Columbia would show 1 per cent and  $1\frac{1}{2}$  per cent, as it now shows.

Mr. STEPHENS of Ohio. That is the point I want to make. And another point is that the actual market value of real estate in the city of Washington would be arrived at according to the income of that particular property, and therefore if that were done it would probably stop some of the profiteering.

Mr. Sisson. My friend has struck the very point. If you take the rental value of property in the last two or three years here, you will see that the property is not assessed in accordance with the rental. I have investigated the subject and have made some inquiries as to conditions in the city of New York, and I find that there the rule for property is that they want 10 per cent gross income on all real estate, and after paying the taxes and expenses if they make from 3 per cent to 5 per cent net they are satisfied.

Now, I have not the time to discuss further the profiteering features, but I want to congratulate the conferees on another agreement, and that is with respect to the Keller item, which has been here for, lo, these many years. Let us understand the Keller item, because, small though it is, it involves an important principle. In straightening out the street on which the property is located there was a store jutting out on the sidewalk, and they desired to make that conform to the street line back toward the city. They established a building line. Mark you, they do not take your property away from you when they establish a building line, but they simply provide that you shall not build on it when a building line has been fixed. It enables you to have a front yard, but it must not be built upon.

They took this store, as I say, which jutting out on the street, and the building line cut the storehouse in two, and Mr. Keller had two lots adjoining next to this store, which was an eyesore. They awarded to the man who had the store about the value of his store building as damages on that. I think \$2,000 was a good price for his building. They gave him damages for that, and in view of the fact that the removal destroyed his business they allowed him additional damages. It cut his wedge-

shaped lot up so badly that it damaged that. But the Keller lots were long lots, and they assessed Mr. Keller with some benefits, because it took away from his property this old store.

Now, Mr. Keller went into court. He had his day in court. The jury decided the suit against him. He did not appeal and the judgment was final. Then he went to the Senate, and notwithstanding the fact that he had had his day in court he demanded \$2,800 damages. We, Mr. Page and I, went to look at the property, Mr. Page at the time being chairman of the subcommittee. All of you who know Mr. Page, of North Carolina, know that he would not do anybody an injustice, and I am sure I would not do it intentionally. But after a careful investigation we concluded that the item ought not to be allowed. If you open up this matter you will find that there is not only one claim, but there are thousands of claims, as we are informed, somewhat similar to this, lying in offices and in various business houses, but particularly in lawyers' offices, and they say if you open this matter up you must let them have the same opportunity which this man has had. But in view of the fact that this man has had his day in court, it would be wrong, in my judgment to reopen the case, because a private citizen who is not in the employ of the Senate and has not the opportunity to present his case to the Members of the Senate every day would be at a disadvantage. You and I and everybody else knows that if Mr. Keller had not had access to the Members of the Senate he would not have gotten that item in the bill at all. I do not believe that this House ought ever to yield on that item.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss other matters, but I am not going to trespass on the time of the committee.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about the so-called half-and-half principle. A good many Members here have probably heard that expression without knowing exactly to what it refers.

During the early history of Washington the city had her own government and assessed her own taxes and paid her own expenses. At times she depended upon the whims or the generosity of Congress. The conditions were so bad between 1870 and 1878 that it was found necessary to do something toward giving the city of Washington a permanent form of government, a permanent system of taxes, and a regular source of revenue for the maintenance of her streets and alleys, for the upkeep of her sidewalks, and for the maintenance of her schools and the other institutions of the city. In 1878 a commission, of which Gen. Blackburn, of Kentucky, was the chairman, brought in a report and provided a charter—or constitution, if you please—for the government of Washington, and gave them a permanent form of government here, with a permanent system of taxation, with a regular source of revenue upon which the city could depend for the maintenance of its streets, alleys, sidewalks, parks, schools, hospitals, and other institutions maintained at public expense.

Ever since 1878 the act creating the fiscal relation between the city and the Federal Government has been known as the half-and-half principle. That act provided that the city of Washington should pay one-half of the appropriations for the maintenance of the city and that the Government of the United States should pay the other half; so that the city has been assessed from year to year to make up its share, for one-half of the appropriations for the city, for the maintenance of a government here that is in keeping with the necessities of a National Capital. In that time the streets have been paved, sidewalks have been laid, a great school system has been established, hospitals are maintained, parks have been made, and one of the most beautiful cities in the world has been created here in Washington.

Before that time the streets were impassable during the winter season. I have talked with elderly persons here who have described to me their efforts to get from the hotels at which they were staying to the door of the carriage when they were invited to the White House. They had to step from one stone to another in order to avoid stepping into anywhere from 3 to 6 inches of mud. Pennsylvania Avenue was a mudhole from the head of the street to the Treasury.

All that has been changed since the adoption of a charter or constitution for the government of Washington, that has given a regular and uniform system of taxation here and a regular and uniform sum out of which the city of Washington could be maintained.

Now it is proposed to change this charter of the city of Washington by a rider on an appropriation bill. It has not received the consideration of a committee authorized to consider legislation touching the welfare of 400,000 people, but in the hurried and fevered conditions of an appropriation-committee room a conclusion is reached that it is not the just way to apportion taxes in the city of Washington and it is proposed to do away with the half-and-half system as provided for in their constitution and to change all that by a rider on an appropriation bill. The matter that these conferees are taking back to conference is as to whether or not they shall recede from their insistence and yield to the Senate amendment striking out the House provision doing away with the half-and-half, or whether the House will recede and let the half-and-half principle stand as it has ever since 1878, under which we have built up the city of Washington.

I say that this principle is provided for in what is Washington's charter or constitution. The Supreme Court has used just that language with respect to it, and I do not believe that Members of the House, who within the last six years have grown tired of legislation by riders, are ready to change the fundamental law of the Capital of the Nation by a rider on the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

Mr. JUUL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. For a brief question.

Mr. JUUL. I have listened to the gentleman very carefully, and I would like to know from him if he thinks it is moral and proper for us to sit and take the money out of the National Treasury and give it to a wealthy city like Washington before Washington has at least paid as much upon the property here as any other property would have to pay in any other city in the Union?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The city of Washington pays on an average about the same rate that is paid by like cities throughout the country.

Mr. JUUL. If the gentleman will give me—

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I can not yield. I wish the gentleman from Illinois would discuss that with Members who are discussing that question. I am now discussing the fundamental law of Washington. The Supreme Court used this language in discussing the fundamental law, the charter of this city:

But our conclusions are not controlled by this construction alone. The court below placed its decision on what we conceive to be the true significance of the act of 1878. As said by that court, it is to be regarded as an organic act, intended to dispose of the whole question of a government for this District. It is, as it were, a constitution for the District. It is declared by its title to be an act to provide "a permanent form of government for the District." The word "permanent" is suggestive. It implies that prior systems had been temporary and provisional. As permanent it is complete in itself.

It is important that the National Capital should have a permanent form of government and a permanent and regular system under which it shall be taxed and governed. A commission recently appointed to investigate this very question used this language, to which I call the attention of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JUUL]:

The committee believes that independently of the question of what should be the proper subjects of taxation in the District of Columbia, the payment of taxes on real estate from the assessments as they are now constituted is a fair and reasonable response in such taxation for municipal benefits received by the citizens of the District.

Further on, and in conclusion, the members of that commission stated:

Our unanimous conclusion is that the rate of taxation in the District should be fixed and certain; that the Congress should pursue a definite policy of regular and liberal appropriations, having in view not only the permanent moral and physical advancement of the city but also its preeminent beauty and grandeur as the municipal expression of the Nation's home and its people's pride.

This report is signed by W. E. Chilton, Willard Saulsbury, and John D. Works for the Senate, and by HENRY T. RAINEY, WARREN GARD, and Henry Allen Cooper for the House.

It seems to me that we should hesitate long before we set aside the charter of the city of Washington by a mere rider on an appropriation bill. If this fundamental law is not the right way to govern this city, if this is not the right way to meet the expenses of the District of Columbia, then let us give it a new charter; but let us not create that charter by a rider on an appropriation bill. Let it be the result of the best judgment of a proper committee of this House, brought in here and considered independently and upon its merits, and not force it through as a necessary part of a bill that provides for the maintenance of the city for the next fiscal year. This is the Capital of the Nation. There are many obligations that we must observe as a Congress. Taking the streets and alleys and

the parks and places for public buildings, the Government of the United States owns a very large portion of the area of the city of Washington.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I may recognize the gentleman a little later. If the Chair will recognize me now, I will make a request. I want to get the previous question on this conference report adopted within the hour. There are many Members who want to talk on the half-and-half amendment. There are only two disputed questions; that is, the half-and-half amendment 45, the Keller proposition. If I can get unanimous consent for the previous question on the conference report within the hour, I am willing that we shall go on for an hour further and discuss the half-and-half and instruct the conferees or do anything that is wanted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Speaker, I think there will be no trouble in making that agreement in the disposition of the conference report. As far as I am personally concerned, we will help the gentleman to get the previous question on the conference report and leave these two items for a reasonable discussion.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. That is what I desire.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that the previous question on the adoption of the conference report be considered as ordered at the expiration of the hour. Is there objection?

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, my colleague and conferee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Cramton], desires five minutes on the report before the previous question is ordered.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw my objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The gentleman from Illinois can get his time after the conference report is adopted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the request of the gentleman from Minnesota that the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the adoption of the conference report at the expiration of 10 minutes, which will be at the end of the hour.

Mr. FESS. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FESS. What will be the effect of the previous question on further discussion if it be ordered. How can you go on indefinitely after the previous question is ordered?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The effect of the previous question at the expiration of an hour will be to close debate on agreeing to the conference report and bring it to a vote immediately. It will permit subsequent discussion of the two amendments which are still in disagreement.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. We can make it by unanimous consent that there be one hour of general debate on the disputed questions.

Mr. FESS. The inquiry I am making is as to the effect of the previous question. Will it not necessarily cut off any further debate on the amendments in disagreement?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It will not affect the amendments in disagreement. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The previous question will be considered as ordered at the expiration of 10 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield three additional minutes to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I was about to suggest some of the obligations that this city is under that other cities of a like size do not encounter. We have embassies here from every country in the world, and it is necessary to police them. We have monuments here that it is necessary to maintain protection for. We have large gatherings here of international visitors, and it becomes necessary to furnish police protection on the arrival of those visitors. There are many things of that character necessary in Washington that are not necessary in Milwaukee, Chicago, Kansas City, or other cities of the country.

In order to do these things, a high order of government has been created here by the Congress of the United States. The citizens of Washington have absolutely no voice in their government or in the amount of their taxation, nor in the way it shall be spent. They can not raise the salary of a school-teacher. They can not fix the salary of a fireman. They can not fix the salary of a policeman. That is done by the votes of gentlemen here. They have absolutely nothing to say about what property shall be taxed or how much it shall be taxed.



They are 400,000 people without representation and without voice as to taxation. There is truly a government in which there is taxation without representation. One of the compensations to the people of Washington for being denizens rather than citizens is that since 1878 we have endeavored to build up a great National Capital and pay one-half of the expenses. [Applause.]

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield seven minutes, all the time remaining, to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON].

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, in the consideration of the portion of the conference report which is in agreement, I would like to call to the attention of the House one or two matters therein. One is the matter relating to the community centers and civic centers.

In 1918 they were given an appropriation of \$10,000, and then they came in for \$5,000 deficiency, making a total of \$15,000. The current year they had an appropriation of \$15,000 and the deficiency is \$6,000, or a total of \$21,000. In the bill as it passed the House they are given \$30,000. The Senate struck out that item, and in conference an agreement has been reached by which they are to receive \$25,000, a larger amount than they ever had heretofore, even with the deficiency, but they are restricted in the use by a proviso that not over 20 per cent shall be used for salaries. In that connection, permit me to call to the attention of the House, and through the RECORD to the attention of those in charge of the work, that in their estimates for \$30,000 they have brought in a salary list of \$18,635, apart from the janitor work.

I am personally heartily in sympathy with the idea of community centers, of the greatest possible use of our public buildings by the people, but I am not in sympathy with an appropriation that is to be a grab bag for every person who has a bid, so that he may get a salary under the Government. I want to state that so far as I am concerned as a member of this committee, when this appropriation again comes before our committee, I hope to go into it more thoroughly than I had the opportunity to do this time.

I deplore the appropriation for janitor work because of this fact. In one school building, for janitor and engineer and fireman, for these occasional meetings, it is proposed to expend as much as \$1,700. I suggest that the people in charge of this work will show a better order of business judgment than heretofore, and will stand better in the opinion of the committees of Congress if they do not spend that \$1,700 in the reckless manner indicated by the estimates.

In the few minutes I have I desire to call the attention of the House to the last amendment in the bill. Amendment No. 136. This was added by the Senate and is known as the Pomerene amendment. When it was offered the introducer in the Senate stated that its purpose was to give "tenants a reasonable time in which to turn around" after the expiration of the Saulsbury law. The Saulsbury law will expire upon definite conclusion of the treaty of peace between the United States and the Imperial German Government. That date, of course, is uncertain. It might come in July; it might not come until October or January; but thereupon, unless some legislation is passed, the Saulsbury law ceases to be effective in the District, and tenants become subject to whatever charges the landlords of the District desire to make. The Pomerene amendment, which was supposed to aid that situation, upon examination proved to be a repeal, upon the taking effect of this law, of the Saulsbury law, and providing in lieu of it, and as permanent law, a 90-day notice to quit in all cases. As a permanent law a 90-day notice to quit is too long, and as a relief to the tenants of the District it would be of no use whatever. This appropriation bill taking effect on the 1st of July, the landlords, under the Pomerene amendment, could give every tenant 90 days' notice, and on the 1st of October, moving day, when the 90 days would expire, there would be evictions or great rental increases. Hence the conferees were successful in agreeing on an amendment which appears in the report, which simply continues or extends in terms the Saulsbury law for a period of 90 days from the time when peace is definitely concluded between the United States and the Imperial German Government. Whether peace be concluded in July or October or January, whatever may be the date, the law is extended for 90 days longer than would otherwise have been the case.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CRAMTON. Certainly.

Mr. GARD. What is the language of the extension of the Saulsbury law?

Mr. CRAMTON. It is very brief—

That the provisions of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to prevent rent profiteering in the District of Columbia, passed May 31, 1918," are extended and continued in full force and effect for the period of 90 days following the definite conclusion of a treaty of peace between the United States and the Imperial German Government.

Mr. GARD. The gentleman has no idea about the time that would cover?

Mr. CRAMTON. That is out of the hands of the District Committee. That is entirely a matter for the future to develop. There is certainly nothing lost.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. This means a definite conclusion of the treaty of peace, not the mere signing of it in Paris, but a definite conclusion of the treaty of peace. The Saulsbury law continues until the end of that, and then 90 days further.

Mr. GARD. What is the gentleman's interpretation of a definite conclusion of peace?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Perhaps a proclamation by the President of the United States.

Mr. CRAMTON. Following a ratification by the Senate of the United States.

Mr. GARD. Which will it be?

Mr. CRAMTON. Following a ratification by the Senate of the United States, and that event is somewhat uncertain, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Your conferees went as far as they could under the amendment. I think we are all interested, many of us personally. As far as I am personally concerned, if the Senate amendment would have permitted it, we might have put it for six months or a year.

Mr. GARD. Unless we get something like it, it will be impossible to live here.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. We could not go any further than that date.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired. The previous question has been ordered. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to was laid on the table.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, there are quite a number of gentlemen on both sides of the question of the half-and-half and the Keller propositions who desire to be heard. I am inclined to be quite liberal. I suggest that by unanimous consent we extend the discussion upon that for an hour or an hour and a half, say until half past 5.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Speaker, I think we can get along with less time than that.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. Sisson. Let me make this suggestion to my friend from Minnesota: I think an hour would be ample time. I do not think we will need half so much time on this side.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LONGWORTH. In the present situation, the conference report having been adopted, who is entitled to the floor and for how long on these two other amendments?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota is entitled to the floor to move to further insist upon a disagreement and ask for a further conference.

Mr. Sisson. If the gentleman will permit—

Mr. LONGWORTH. He is not entitled to time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes; he is entitled to an hour.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman from Minnesota is entitled to an hour, at any time within which he can move the previous question?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Unless by unanimous consent the time shall be extended.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Then I understand that debate will be limited to an hour?

Mr. Sisson. Will the gentleman ask that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] control half the time and the gentleman control half the time?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I am perfectly willing to do so.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman yield? In order to bring these two amendments before the House, in order to get something before the House, it will either be proper for the gentleman from Minnesota to move that the House further insist or, if he sees fit, that the House concur, but there must be some motion pending before the House.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will make that motion, Mr. Speaker, that the House further insist on its disagreement upon these two amendments and ask for a further conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota moves that the House further insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendments No. 1 and No. 45 and ask for a further conference.

Mr. Sisson. Now, the debate is on that motion. Do I understand that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] controls half the time?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Yes; he to control 30 minutes and I to control the other 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that the motion pending before the House is to further insist upon the disagreement on amendment No. 1 and amendment No. 45 to the District of Columbia appropriation bill, and the gentleman from Minnesota is entitled to an hour.

Mr. Sisson. Now, it is understood the gentleman from Minnesota is to yield 30 minutes of that time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I yield 30 minutes of time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN], and I will control the other 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota yields 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, the House kindly gave me 30 minutes to address the House immediately after the conference reports were acted upon to-day, but as it looks now it will be about 6 o'clock before that happens, and I do not believe that at that hour I could inform the House very much on anything, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that instead of taking 30 minutes to-day that I have 30 minutes immediately after the reading of the Journal to-morrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] asks unanimous consent that he may have 30 minutes to address the House immediately after the reading of the Journal to-morrow and the disposition of business upon the Speaker's table—

Mr. KITCHIN. No; immediately after the reading of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Immediately after the reading of the Journal to-morrow in place of the 30 minutes accorded him by special order to-day after disposition of conference reports. Is there objection?

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would ask the gentleman from North Carolina if he would not include in his request that I be given 20 minutes.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman can ask that after I obtain consent; there will be no objection to that on this side at all.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent for 20 minutes to-morrow after the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina to-morrow he may address the House for 20 minutes instead of occupying the 20 minutes accorded him by special order to-day. Is there objection?

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire what is to be before the House to-morrow?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The water-power bill probably will be before the House to-morrow.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ESCH. It is not likely we can reach the water-power bill to-night; will that remain the continuing order for to-morrow?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is of the opinion that under the order adopted in reference to the water-power bill that it remains the continuing order to-morrow, although the House has adopted an order making House joint resolution 139 in order to-morrow after the reading of the Journal. These requests of the gentleman from North Carolina and the gentleman from Pennsylvania will supersede—

Mr. ESCH. Subject to those two items of business, it would be the continuing order, notwithstanding the fact that to-morrow will be devoted ordinarily to pensions?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has that impression.

Mr. DYER. May I inquire of the gentleman from Wisconsin, if the water-power bill is taken up to-morrow, there will be general debate on it?

Mr. ESCH. Yes; there will be a limited amount of general debate.

Mr. DYER. Then I will ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if he would be willing to take time in general debate?

Mr. HULINGS. I would prefer very much the other arrangement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to get half a minute to make a statement—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to proceed for half a minute. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Immediately upon adjournment of the House to-day there will be a session of the Democratic caucus in this Hall, notice of which is now being given.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield eight minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP]. [Applause.]

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I had not intended to make any remarks whatever on this question, but after listening to the remarks of my good friend, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], I could not restrain myself. I am sure when you listened to the remarks of the gentleman from Kansas you thought that the people of the District had assembled in mass meeting, in solemn convention, and had adopted a sacred constitution.

It may interest you to know that this holy instrument that he designates as the constitution is nothing in the world but an act of Congress, just like any and every other act of Congress. It may astonish you when I tell you this holy act has been amended several times, but as the amendments lowered the taxes of the property owners of Washington no objection was urged to so changing this "organic constitution." And some of these amendments were passed as riders on appropriation bills. Now, speaking to my new colleagues, I want to give you some of the history of this fight. Of course, I can not do it in seven minutes.

But from 1802 to about 1874 the District of Columbia was managed by a mayor and city council, just as every other city in the United States is managed, and Congress had nothing whatever to do with the management of the affairs of the District of Columbia. If you will look in front of the Municipal Building, on Pennsylvania Avenue, you will see a statue, and that statue is one of Mr. Shepherd, the last mayor of the District of Columbia. Up to that time the citizens of the District of Columbia levied their own taxes, managed their own affairs, just as every other city in the United States does, and Congress from time to time made appropriations, because Congress thought it was equitable, on account of the Government owning much property here, that the Government should make contributions to the support and maintenance of the government of the District. At the time of the solemn, sacred act of Congress, June 11, 1878, when the half-and-half principle was adopted, it was adopted to apply to the then city of Washington, which comprised what is known as Georgetown and Washington, embracing about 5,000 acres. The half-and-half principle to-day has been extended, and the people of the United States are made to pay half the expenses of maintaining a 50,000-acre tract of land, the whole District of Columbia.

My good friend from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] spoke of the deplorable condition of the streets—the mud, and so forth—at the time this sacred instrument was adopted in 1878. I apprehend every city in the United States about that time was in a similar condition. When you went out in the rain you walked in mud.

Now, I can not take it up in detail in the time allowed me, gentlemen, but you will find that in the city of Washington only one tax is levied, and that is the city tax. They do not pay here any county or State tax, as you and I do in our respective States, but all taxes collected here are embraced in this one tax. If you compare the tax levy here on real estate you will find it is lower than the tax levied in any other city in the United States anywhere like the city of Washington in population, after deducting, as Mr. Noyes and the other advocates of the half-and-half do in arriving at their figures, county and State taxes. But you who own property in other cities have to pay county and State taxes, just as you pay city taxes. Are the citizens here better than your constituents and entitled to have the United States pay half their taxes? I do not think so.

In the Sixty-fourth Congress I introduced a bill to repeal this half-and-half plan, and in every Congress since then the House has passed a resolution repealing the act of June 11, 1878, known as the half-and-half plan, and always the Senate refuses to consent to the repeal; and up to this hour the half-and-half principle is still in force, and the advocates of the half-and-half prin-



ciple look to the Senate as their bulwark to protect the half-and-half, and up to this good hour they have not looked in vain.

When we had this bill up in the present Congress this month the abrogation of the half-and-half principle was passed by the House without any debate. The Senate puts it back, and the bill is now here with the half-and-half principle involved. What do the advocates of the half-and-half plan say? They say you should not take advantage of the people here; that you should not do something in haste and repeal the half-and-half. As I told you, every House since the Sixty-fourth Congress has repealed it, and in that Congress the House passed a bill repealing it, and the Senate disagreed to it.

The bill was put in conference, and the conferees could not agree. The House was determined to stand and see that the half-and-half principle was repealed, and as a compromise a commission was appointed to investigate the principle as to whether the half-and-half should be repealed. And for two or three months in Washington hearings were had, and the result of those hearings was that the commission thought the half-and-half should be repealed.

Now, gentlemen, we who are advocating the repeal of the half-and-half seek to do no injustice to the people of the District of Columbia. We agree with my friend from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] that there should be a definite, specific tax levied here. What do we advocate? We advocate that Congress levy a tax upon the property owners of the District of Columbia to the amount that Congress thinks just, right, and equitable, and then, we say, let that tax be collected, and whatever it lacks of raising a sufficient amount of money to run the affairs of the District of Columbia as Congress says it should be run, let the deficit be appropriated out of the Federal Treasury.

What is the result under your present half-and-half plan? As I said a moment ago, the tax rate here is less than it is in any other city, and notwithstanding that small rate there has accumulated in the Treasury of the United States over \$5,000,000 to the credit of the District of Columbia.

Now, what do we say do? Levy whatever rate of taxation you think just and first use that money for the District, and if it is insufficient for its needs appropriate whatever additional amount may be necessary out of the Federal Treasury. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JUUL].

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I listened with a great deal of interest to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] when he stood here in front of the Members of this Congress of the United States and said to me that I was talking about little questions. Gentlemen, this bill, and another bill in this House, gives to the city of Washington and vicinity eight and one-quarter millions of dollars as a free gift. And before the other States and cities in the Union are called upon to donate, they should first find out whether or not the gift is needed, and then, if the gift is needed, they ought to find out whether we are in a position just now, with a great war on our hands and with many of the bills yet to be paid, to ask the taxpayers of this country to give money away to cities that do not need our money.

Now, the city of Washington pays approximately 1½ per cent on two-thirds of the appraised value of the property in the District of Columbia. And the gentleman from Kansas stated that owing to the fact that it is the Capital of the Nation, they had to have police, that they had to have schools, that they had to have parks.

Now, gentlemen, I have once before compared the tax situation in the city that I in part represent with the tax situation in Washington, D. C. We also have a police force, and the city pays the police, and the city to-day levies a tax of \$1.97 for every \$100 worth of property owned out there. We also have a park system, and we take a pride in our park system, and we like to keep it up and make our boulevards beautiful; but we have to step up to the tax collector's desk and pay for park purposes in most of the towns composing the city of Chicago 70 cents additional for every \$100 of valuation. But those taxes do not represent all that is being paid. We pay in addition to that 80 cents on every \$100 of valuation as our contribution to the State of Illinois.

We pay also for our schools \$1.87 per \$100 valuation, and the totals last year amounted to \$6.38 for every \$100 valuation in the city of Chicago, based upon one-third of the fair cash value. Then we are called upon as citizens of the great State of Illinois, and you are called upon as citizens of your respective States, after having paid taxes of this kind, to permit the

city of Washington to come in and take the money that ought to be paid as pensions to our soldiers, to be paid for artificial arms and legs for those soldiers, and for general national purposes—you are called upon to take that money out of the Treasury in broad daylight and hand it over to one of the wealthiest communities in the country, and to say, "Here is our gift to you." Now, I maintain that this city does not need the gift, and I maintain that it is indecent and dishonest on our part to stick our arms down into the Treasury of the United States and hand them the money. [Applause.]

Every time I have seen a little girl or boy during the war days going about the city selling war stamps, asking people to buy a quarter's worth of war stamps or a dollar's worth of war stamps, I have sat down after I had listened to the little boy or girl and tried to figure out how many thousands of little children in the United States were going around in the same way appealing to people to buy war stamps, and realized that instead of all of it going into the Treasury of the United States to run the war, seven millions of it went into the coffers of the city of Washington to run purely local affairs. [Applause.]

Can we agree upon the proposition that there is nothing in the school system here that ought to be helped? Yet you will find the school system in the bill 50 cents on the dollar. Out our way we pay, ourselves, what it takes to educate our children, and we pay 100 cents on the dollar.

Now, suppose the police force of the city of Washington does what my distinguished friend from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] and the city of Washington say it does. He was very kind to me and directed at me some good-natured jibes and gave me some advertising that I would not otherwise have received, and as a consequence I am grateful to him. [Laughter.] He speaks pathetically of these school children, and he speaks of the police force, and he refers to foreign ambassadors. With a city tax of \$1.97 per \$100 valuation in our city we manage to pay our policemen. The people here pay \$1.50 for all purposes, and then, in addition to the burdens that we bear, they come to us and want us to help them.

I have read a great many articles here on the subject of Washington's taxes, and what they are continually hammering on, gentlemen, is the per capita. Most of you gentlemen have been in municipal life and in county and State offices at home, and you, all of you, know that when they talk about per capita in the matter of taxation they are talking bunk—b-u-n-k, pure and simple. [Laughter.] The per capita, the number of inhabitants or the number of dwellers in any given city, has absolutely nothing to do with taxation, and I will tell you why. They never levy a tax on the fellow who has not got anything, and you know why. It is because they can not collect it. The per capita tax that they are continually speaking about, showing that Washington pays more than any other city, I will explain to you in this way: Taxes are levied, not per capita, but on property, tangible and intangible. We pay \$1.97, as I said to you before, on the \$100 valuation, for city purposes, but we also pay the State, the county, for sanitary district, for parks, in addition thereto. Now, gentlemen, I want to be fair—

Mr. KETTNER. And for schools and roads.

Mr. JUUL. Yes; and for schools and roads, and we pay a sanitary-district tax. I want to be fair. I am getting to love this city. When they tried to put me out of business in Illinois last fall, I loved this city so well that I tried to come back, and I am glad I succeeded myself. [Laughter.] But I want, when I look into my mirror, to see in the glass the reflection of the face of an honest man, and if I hear of something going on down here that, in my judgment, ought not to continue, I do not want to sit still and listen to it. We have no more business to put our arms into the Treasury of the United States and give money to a city that is able to take care of itself than we have to turn that money over to New York or Chicago.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUUL. Yes; I will yield to my colleague.

Mr. MADDEN. I wonder if the gentleman would be willing that the Government of the United States should pay any part of the taxes on account of the vast amount of property it owns here?

Mr. JUUL. I will come to that in a moment, and I want to say that I hope I will succeed in making gentlemen here understand that I am honest, even on that proposition. I feel, however, that the possession of the National Government in a city is so great an asset that nothing can be compared with it. There is a flood of gold poured out of the United States Treasury into the lap of the citizens here, so that they can well afford to pay even that which the Nation ought to pay for the frontage it owns.

But they go further here in their indecency, in their diving into the money boxes of this country. Streets are being paved that are located miles and miles away from the Nation's property, and they have got the nerve to come in here and ask you and your States to pay a share of the frontage tax for a local improvement that has not anything to do with national governmental affairs or the Nation at all.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUUL. Yes; with the greatest pleasure. The more I yield the better I get along.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Who ordered that pavement?

Mr. JUUL. The National Congress of the United States, sitting as a town board. And I want to tell the gentleman that I am dead against this Congress sitting as a city council or town board, sitting here in solemn session spending its time on local questions relating to the government of the city of Washington. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD].

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, quite recently the distinguished Speaker of this House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET], had the courage and the sense of justice to make declaration before the assembled Chamber of Commerce of the city of Washington that the half-and-half proposition was no longer necessary and should not be maintained as a legislative proposition. [Applause.] Immediately there was newspaper editorial comment, and the question was raised of the sacred charter or constitution of the District of Columbia. And now we find upon the desk of Members to-day a document purporting to be the argument of Theodore W. Noyes before the joint select committee of the Congress of the United States; a document printed in the Government Printing Office, coming here to all of us under Government frank, spending the Government's money to bring to you the statement of the man representing—I say it with the utmost respect—representing the great interests in the District of Columbia and the principal advocate of the so-called "half-and-half." This statement comes to us paid for by the Government under official frank. And we also saw in last night's edition of the paper which Mr. Noyes owns—a most excellent paper, I may say—the statement that the half-and-half principle was not condemned by the commission which recently investigated the matter. Now, I rise principally for the purpose of showing the Members of the House who have not been here long exactly what this joint select committee did.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARD. I have not very much time, but I will yield for a question.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What is the document that the gentleman alludes to as having been put before us?

Mr. GARD. The argument or brief of Theodore W. Noyes, a prominent and wealthy Washingtonian, before the joint select committee of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is it a part of the report of the joint select committee?

Mr. GARD. No; it is the argument of Theodore W. Noyes in behalf of the half-and-half principle.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Where did it come from?

Mr. GARD. I do not know where it came from, but it was printed in the Government Printing Office and came to us under some official frank.

As I say, I desire to tell gentlemen about this committee. It was appointed in 1915, and three members were appointed by the Speaker of this House at that time, and those three members were Mr. Henry T. Rainey, of Illinois; Mr. Henry Allen Cooper, of Wisconsin, and myself; and there were three Senators—Mr. Chilton, of West Virginia; Mr. Saulsbury, of Delaware; and Mr. Works, of California.

The committee met. In all, the committee was in session 40 days. The interests were all before the committee—the allied organizations, the real estate owners—all in favor of the half-and-half, persistently and insistently, and after very complete hearings this committee found that the purposes of the half-and-half were no longer necessary and that it should not be maintained; that there was no reason for any arbitrary rule of proportionate contribution.

Mr. JUUL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARD. Yes.

Mr. JUUL. I want the gentleman to bring out whether he was a member of the commission.

Mr. GARD. Yes; I was a member of the commission, and I speak of the fact, because there have been statements made here and in newspapers about what was meant in this report. I want

to tell you that I know what was meant, because, with the exception of the last paragraph added at the last moment, the entire report was written by me, and I know what it means. [Applause.] I know that not alone in the minds of the committee at that time but in the mind of every fair-minded man who has ever investigated these affairs in the District of Columbia there is absolutely no necessity for the half-and-half. No man can hear or read any considerable portion of the evidence and believe that the half-and-half is any longer necessary in this day of great change in District finances.

Let me read to you from the report of the Auditor of the District of Columbia this language:

The surplus on hand, cash and credit to the general fund of the District of Columbia in the Treasury of the United States at the end of the fiscal year June 30, 1918, \$6,051,313.95. Some charges against the fund reduce it, but the present surplus, added again, nearly totals the above amount.

There is the gist of it. What we are doing under the half-and-half as Washington has developed is that we are taking the taxes, and in addition to what they pay as taxes—they collect here about \$9,000,000—we put \$9,000,000 of your money and your constituents' money in the coffers of the District of Columbia, and they do not spend it because they can not spend it. Here, now, with everything that is taken out in 1919, June 30, a few days from now, there will be about \$6,000,000 unexpended to the credit of the District of Columbia in the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARD. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The gentleman says that the District can not spend it. I will ask the gentleman if the District of Columbia did not appeal for larger appropriations than Congress is willing to make, and if the appropriations had been made as requested by the citizens of the District of Columbia there would be no surplus in the Treasury?

Mr. GARD. If every dollar requested, on most liberal estimates by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia for several years past, were appropriated by Congress without reduction, there would still be three or four million dollars unexpended in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia know what the District needs; they know what improvements are needed; they know what streets are needed; they know what buildings are needed—everything that goes to make this the great Capital City of the Nation—and that is what I want to do. But I am not in favor of creating here a vast unexpended and unnecessary credit in the Treasury for the District of Columbia of the money from Indiana, from Kansas, from Nebraska, Maine, and New York and piling it up here so that in a few years, perchance, they may seek to abrogate the tax levy entirely.

Now, I desire to bring to the attention of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], who made inquiry, that I have figures from the assessor's office showing that all United States property, religious and educational property, in this city amounts to \$288,000,000, while the privately owned property is estimated at \$410,000,000; and that is two-thirds valuation, so that the total value is \$615,000,000.

Those are the latest figures from the assessor's office of the District of Columbia, being a difference between \$430,000,000 and \$650,000,000—nearly \$200,000,000—on behalf of the privately owned property; and yet they say the Nation must appropriate as much as they contribute in taxation for the maintenance of this city.

If that was necessary, I would be for it, because I want to do everything I can to make the Capital of the United States the premier city, not alone of the United States but of the world. Some one said the other day that in a few years it will not be the capital of the United States but the capital of the world, as far as government is concerned; and I want to see it properly maintained. I want to say that the proposition which calls for loading up a huge credit of the District of Columbia is absolutely indefensible, and no man, no matter what his personal interests may be, can defend it; and no man seeks to defend the half-and-half unless he has some personal interest in it.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I challenge the statement of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GARD. I made no personal reference to the gentleman, and certainly charge no improper interest to him.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. But I have just defended the half-and-half principle on this floor, and I have not a dollar's worth of property in this District.

Mr. GARD. I am sorry to learn that the gentleman has no property here, but if the gentleman chooses to put himself in the category of those who are interested in the District, he may do so.



Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I am not interested in the District except as a citizen of the United States interested in his Capital.

Mr. GARD. I have no quarrel with the gentleman—

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. And I do not even live here.

Mr. GARD. Or about any of his possessions, but I say and repeat that no man, after an intelligent investigation, can defend the principle of the half-and-half as it exists in this community to-day. It is to-day absolutely unnecessary and economically wrong.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of residence in the city of Washington more than 25 years ago. The half-and-half proposition was an issue then as it is now. It has been up here at regular intervals ever since I have had the honor of a seat in this House. I have long felt that Congress should not take away the half-and-half principle until we are prepared to give the people in this District representation in the House and in the Senate. I think this complaint will continue indefinitely until the actual residents of the District of Columbia have representation. No matter how beneficial a plan is offered to them, they will be dissatisfied. Taxation without representation is never pleasant. I have no sympathy with the statements printed from time to time that the taxes here are excessive as compared with other cities, but I think that has nothing to do with it as long as we deny to the actual residents of the District the right to participate in the management of their affairs. I hope the time will soon come when Congress will authorize a census of the District of Columbia to find the number of actual residents of the District. When that time comes I think the people who acclaim that they have a population of 400,000 here will find that they have not in actual residents as many as they have inhabitants. But that is neither here nor there. I rose for the purpose of saying that in my opinion Congress should not take away this plan which has existed, or determine on any other plan, until we have given the citizens of the District the right to vote and have given them representation in Congress. I yield back whatever time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman yields back three minutes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson].

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that this matter has been up in Congress for at least seven consecutive years. It has been debated here at length on this floor. The Senate has never debated it but once, and that for a very short time; and after a discussion there of a very short time by the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. James, and the Senator from Iowa, Mr. KENYON, two men themselves who were not thoroughly familiar with it, about one-third of the Senate voted for this very amendment. This last time not one word was said about it.

As I understand it, the thing the real estate people of the District of Columbia want is that we shall recede from this amendment and let the matter be taken up as a separate piece of legislation. In 1915 they asked that a joint commission be appointed, and the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. UNDERWOOD, then a Member of the House, offered a resolution, and such a committee was appointed. When that committee reported, it reported unanimously against the half-and-half principle, and the Senate members of that committee voted unanimously against it. Not a single one of them said a word in favor of the half-and-half. I have read the report of the committee very carefully, and the statement that they had indorsed it is, in my judgment, a misinterpretation of what the committee said. They did say that the assessment was fair. In this amendment we do not ask to change the assessment; we do not ask to change the rate of taxation. This amendment has been carefully prepared by a subcommittee that went carefully into the matter. It is not a thing that has been hastily done, as men would have you believe, but it was done after deliberation, after debate. The amendment was carefully drawn, so that it does not in any way interfere with the assessment or the rate of taxation. It simply says that the people of the District will continue to pay the same rate of taxation they are now paying on the same assessment they are now paying, not a single dollar extra, but that the money collected shall first be applied to the payment of the expenses of the District, and the Federal Congress shall pay whatever is necessary to make up what they appropriate.

And that is as fair, that is as just, a proposition as can be found, and yet you hear gentlemen speak here endeavoring to make you believe a violent assault is being made upon a sacred thing, an act of Congress passed in 1878 for the purpose of relieving the taxpayers of the District of Columbia from absolute

bankruptcy, and at that time they were assessing property under the same rule as now and paying upon two-thirds of that assessment, and the rate was about 1½ cents on two-thirds value and has remained so, and everyone in this House realizes that taxation in every other city in the United States has been gradually increasing all the time, because the cities demand better improvements, and while the taxes in the States—the States you come from as their representatives in the Federal Congress—have, I say, been going up all the time, the rate of taxation here in the District has remained 1½ on a two-thirds value, or 1 per cent on full value, and yet the statement is made that here we are trying to do the District an injustice. I know my heart and my mind, and I know I would not do an injustice to a human being in the District of Columbia. I have never served upon this committee because I wanted to serve upon it, and not a single chairman of the Committee on Appropriations but will tell you I have gone on this committee under protest. This is a service that has been wished upon me, and I have simply endeavored to perform my duty and give to the Congress the facts as they have been developed after these years of investigation; and yet men call it undue haste to put a rider upon an appropriation bill. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I have no dollar's worth of property, real estate or personal, for that matter, except that I pay my bills and have my belongings where I live, at the hotel. I am not going to discuss the question of whether we should enact this legislation or not. It is absolutely a practical question.

I understand from the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD] that there is \$6,000,000 to the credit of the District of Columbia in the Treasury of the United States. Never can one dollar of that money come out of that Treasury unless Congress says so. They say we will get more money from taxation than half the sum required to pay the expenses of the District of Columbia. Well, under the law it goes into the Treasury of the United States and does not bear interest. There it is. It may amount up to \$12,000,000. I do not know what it will amount to. This body levies the taxes; that is, it legislates, and if the House and Senate agree upon an increase or a decrease of taxation, there it is.

Now, it is to me, as I said, purely a practical question. This putting of riders on appropriation bills has become quite popular. Frequently they are put on in the Senate, and sometimes they are awfully disagreeable, and sometimes they are somewhat disagreeable when we ourselves put the riders on. But it is against the rules of the House, and, as I understand it and if my recollection is correct, against the rules of the Senate, to put riders on appropriation bills. The District of Columbia appropriation bill failed in March because the Senate would not give way and the House would not give way. This bill may fail in the same way, I suppose. That would leave the District government, that we created by legislation, without anything to sustain it, police force or anything else, and in these days of the Bolsheviki that would be unfortunate.

I do not know whether this bill is to fail or not. I am perfectly willing to go to work and use this money that is in the Treasury for the benefit of the Treasury, so far as that is concerned, if it can be worked out; but I apprehend it can not be, although it might be utilized now in any way they choose to utilize it, the House, the Senate, and the President agreeing.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. Of this \$6,000,000 that is in the Treasury, is it not a fact that \$6,000,000 of the people's money is applied to the expenses of this District, of which the taxpayers of the District have the benefit?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, half and half have been appropriated since 1878 to the present time.

Now, as to the practical question: The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS], chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the bill, moves that the House further insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment and asks for a further conference. I have no objection, so far as that is concerned. But sometime between this and the 1st day of July this appropriation has to be made. The Senate was stubborn before and the bill failed; and we were stubborn. The \$6,000,000 in the Treasury is over and above what was raised by taxation which Congress levied. There has been sufficient to pay the District's half and accumulate the money in the Treasury. It never can be gotten out of the Treasury without an act of Congress.

I will not discuss the question about the District's representation in Congress—with a Member in the House and two in the Senate. It was never intended that the District should have

representation. The people here are mostly Government employees, and those that are not Government employees live upon the official population that is here. It was never intended that they should have representation and I will never so vote. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Most of the employees here vote back in the States.

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time, seven minutes, to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, practically everything that can be said on this proposition on both sides has been said, but I wish to invite attention, and particular attention, to the proposition which the House, for nearly half a dozen years now, has adopted at each Congress, and which the other end of this Capitol—and which, I believe, Mr. Speaker CLARK at the last session said could not be mentioned—has defeated. As many times as the House has adopted this change the unmentionable body has put it back to the old status.

Listen to this and see what could be more fair. This is the House proposition:

That the following sums are appropriated out of the revenues of the District of Columbia to the extent that they are sufficient therefor, and the remainder out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. But the amount to be paid from the Treasury of the United States shall in no event be as much as one-half of said expenses.

Now, as I explained the other day in talking about this and also about some unmentionables, I stated that this clause was put in by the House so that it would not be subject to a point of order—that is, that the United States should pay less than half; should not pay as much as half. Under the Holman rule this amendment is strictly in order and in conformity with the rules of the House. But what can be more fair, now that the United States is paying one-half of the expenses of the District of Columbia? This says that the money of the District of Columbia shall be used as far as it goes, and after that the United States Government shall contribute all the rest that is needed, provided, however, it shall not contribute as much as one-half. If you strike off one cent or one dollar, then the United States will not contribute as much as one-half. But why, will somebody please tell me, should the United States Government continue to contribute as much as one-half of the expenses of the District of Columbia, with a surplus growing all the time to the credit of the District of Columbia?

It has just been said that this money is in the Treasury of the United States, and it can not be gotten out except by act of Congress. Why is it there? Because when the people of the District of Columbia had their own legislature and their own officials, and when they had the ballot for the election of those officials, they went into debt, and they would not trust each other, and Congress would not trust any of them, and consequently, in order to avoid the expense and, added to that, the distrust, Congress provided the money should be put into the United States Treasury for safe-keeping. And Congress went further than that. When the accounts were to be examined between the United States and the District of Columbia, according to solemn act of Congress, it was provided that nobody who lived in the District of Columbia should be selected for that purpose. Distrust and lack of confidence ran to that extent at that time, so wasteful of the public means had the local officers been.

Somebody has said that if Congress would appropriate this \$6,000,000 it would be spent in the District of Columbia, because the United States Government owns so much property here. The United States owns Lafayette Square in front of the White House. It is worth millions of dollars.

The United States is losing interest in carrying that. The United States is losing a large sum every year in keeping it as a park. For whose benefit? For the man in California? No. For the man in Maine? No. For the people here in the District of Columbia. [Applause.] The United States Government owns Franklin Square down here at Fourteenth and K Streets. Millions of dollars are invested in it. It is carrying that as it is carrying the park in front of the White House. For whose benefit is that park? And yet it is to be charged up to the United States on the tax system. Nobody gets the benefit of it except the people and the children who live here. Lincoln Park is another park that the United States Government is carrying the same way. The District of Columbia is full of them. Take Potomac Park. Potomac Park has been made in the last few years by pumping the mud and water out of the Potomac River behind the bank that the United States Government has built. Potomac Park has been made in that way. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for seven minutes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, the language of the House bill provided that all the revenues of the District should be used for District expenses and the balance taken from the Public Treasury. The provision substituted by the Senate provides for equal expenditures.

It may interest the House to know that the revenue of the District estimated for the ensuing year would be \$9,547,000, and that the expenditures for the District, including not only the bill before you, but the District items in the sundry civil and the deficiency and the legislative bills, would amount to approximately \$18,000,000; so that whatever you do with the language in the first section of the bill, the people of the District will pay something like 50 per cent of the expenses of the District.

If the House provision is continued, roughly speaking—we have no knowledge yet what the deficiency for the ensuing year will be—but roughly speaking under the House provision the District will not pay over 55 per cent, and the United States will pay 45 per cent.

Further, I find that in 1912 the total appropriations on all bills for the District were \$11,370,000, and for the current year \$18,000,000, an increase of over 50 per cent in a few years; so that it is manifest that it is not the purpose of Congress—the same Congress that has all the time been voting to abolish the half-and-half—to be unfriendly to the District or its institutions.

But, my friends, this afternoon we are facing a very definite and important situation. It seems to me we ought to face the facts. Since I have been in Congress every time this matter has come to a vote in the House I have voted to abolish the half-and-half, and I hope that sometime that will come about, and it will be no harm to the District, but a benefit, when it comes. It may not be improper for me to say that, as a member of the subcommittee on the District of Columbia appropriation bill, I voted to put in the language abolishing the half-and-half, and that in the full Committee on Appropriations I again voted to retain that language.

Now, as one of your conferees upon this bill, I have a deliberate responsibility, and I want to say to the House that the question that is before you now is not whether you will abolish the half-and-half, but whether you will have this appropriation bill go into force and effect on the 1st day of July. Sometimes in the past we have had difficulties about conferences with the Senate on this bill. We had no difficulty this year in meeting the Senate conferees, and while there was no extended argument in conference on this item, we certainly had a satisfactory exchange of views, sufficient to satisfy me, as one of your representatives on that conference, that the Senate will not, before the 1st of July, recede on that item.

Furthermore, if you send the bill back to the Senate for further action, so far as I know, there is no voice ready to be raised in the Senate on our side of this issue. When the bill was in the Senate before the only voice that spoke was that of Mr. NUGENT, who announced his future opposition, and that of Mr. KING, who stated that in this emergency he did not feel that he should raise the question, but gave notice that at another time, when the question could come up with proper time for investigation, he would raise the question.

Now, on the contrary, by insisting upon this provision, you can prevent the bill from becoming a law by the 1st day of July, because this is the 26th of June, and there remain now during June but three legislative days, and in that time we must dispose still of the deficiency, the Army, the Navy, and the sundry civil bills, four great appropriation bills, in those three days. So you can prevent this bill from becoming a law by insisting on the House provision, but you can not abolish the half-and-half.

On the other hand, I am privileged to state that in the presence of the chairman of the Senate committee on District legislation [Senator SHERMAN] we were assured that if a bill came from the House to the Senate abolishing the half-and-half, it would have due consideration in the Senate committee.

I do not understand that to mean that the committee agrees to report it favorably or that it will be passed by the Senate, but I believe it to be a sincere statement that the bill will have the fair consideration of that committee. I have known the chairman of the House Committee on the District of Columbia [Mr. MAPES] for many years, and I have the most absolute confidence in his ability, his integrity, and his sincerity; and in view of that attitude of the Senate District Committee,



I am satisfied to let our House District Committee have an opportunity to take up this question as a purely legislative matter and bring it before this House for our action and then send it to the Senate; and then, if that method does not secure results, there will be other District of Columbia appropriation bills.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared as a conferee to follow the instructions of the House. But I feel I ought to give my own judgment sincerely and frankly to the House, and that is that good legislation and the best interests of all concerned will be secured by getting final action on this bill and having it disposed of and getting it out of the way of other important measures; and in order to secure that we should recede from our opposition to Senate amendment No. 1 and leave the conferees free, and I am sure that there will be no trouble about amendment No. 45.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] for another matter, not to be taken out of my time.

#### ARMY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN], chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, I desire to submit a request that he be allowed to file a conference report on the military bill for printing in the Record under the rule, after the adjournment to-day and before 12 o'clock to-night.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wyoming, on behalf of the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN], chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, asks unanimous consent that a conference report on the Army bill may be presented for printing under the rule after the adjournment to-day and before 12 o'clock midnight. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The conference report is as follows:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, having met, after full and free conference have been unable to agree.

JULIUS KAHN,  
D. R. ANTHONY, Jr.,  
S. H. DENT, Jr.,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

J. W. WADSWORTH, Jr.,  
HOWARD SUTHERLAND,  
GEO. E. CHAMBERLAIN,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will resume consideration of the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I have been on the District conference committee six or seven years. The question that we have been discussing here has been as earnestly discussed during all that time as it has been to-day, and more time has been given to it. Now, I want to indorse every word that my colleague [Mr. CRAMTON] has said.

I want to say that I believe the District legislative committee will give, as they have stated, earnest consideration to legislation along the line of the half-and-half; and my suggestion now to this House is, after years of deliberation, that the Committee on the District of Columbia, having charge of legislation relating to the District of Columbia, and the similar committee of the Senate, are willing and ready to take this matter up and settle it in a legislative manner; and my honest judgment is that we will gain nothing whatever at this time by further consideration of this question upon this District of Columbia appropriation bill. I simply ask for a further conference in order that we may wind up this matter in a parliamentary way.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota moves to further insist on the disagreement of the House to the Senate amendments?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The motion of the gentleman from Minnesota is that the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendments 1 and 45.

Mr. RAKER. I present a preferential motion, that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 1.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question comes first upon the motion of the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER], a preferential motion, that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 1.

The question being taken, the motion of Mr. Raker was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question recurs on the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] that the House insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendments Nos. 1 and 45.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, the House having refused to concur in the Senate amendment, is not that tantamount to non-concurrence, so that it is not necessary to put the motion?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The motion of the gentleman from California included only one of the amendments. The motion of the gentleman from Minnesota includes both of them.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. We have the Keller proposition also?

Mr. CRISP. I had overlooked that.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House further insist on its disagreement to Senate amendments 1 and 45, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that the House further insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendments No. 1 and No. 45 and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi offers a motion which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Sisson moves to instruct the House conferees not to agree to Senate amendment No. 1.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky) there were 73 yeas and 51 noes.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that no quorum is present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California makes the point that no quorum is present and evidently there is not. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, and the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. All those in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi will answer "aye" and those opposed will answer "no."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 159, nays 129, not voting 139, answered "present" 3, as follows:

#### YEAS—159.

Alexander	Doughton	Lankford	Riordan
Almon	Dowell	Layton	Robinson, N. C.
Anderson	Drane	Lazaro	Robson, Ky.
Ashbrook	Dunbar	Lea, Calif.	Romjue
Ayres	Echols	Leshner	Rose
Babka	Edmonds	Loneragan	Rouse
Bankhead	Evans, Nev.	McAndrews	Rubey
Barbour	Ferris	McKeown	Sanders, La.
Barkley	Fields	McLane	Sanders, Va.
Bee	Fisher	Mapes	Schall
Begg	Frear	Mays	Sears
Black	Gandy	Michener	Sells
Bland, Mo.	Gard	Miller	Sisson
Blanton	Garner	Minahan, N. J.	Small
Boies	Garrett	Mondell	Smithwick
Box	Goodwin, Ark.	Moon	Stedman
Brand	Graham, Ill.	Mooney	Stevenson
Brinson	Green, Iowa	Moore, Ohio	Summers, Wash.
Brumbaugh	Hardy, Colo.	Morgan	Summers, Tex.
Buchanan	Hastings	Nelson, Mo.	Taylor, Ark.
Byrnes, S. C.	Haugen	Nelson, Wis.	Taylor, Colo.
Byrnes, Tenn.	Hersman	Newton, Minn.	Thomas
Caldwell	Howard	Nichols, S. C.	Thompson, Okla.
Candler	Huddleston	Nichols, Mich.	Tillman
Caraway	Hudspeth	Nolan	Upshaw
Carew	Hull, Tenn.	O'Connell	Venable
Carter	Igoe	O'Conner	Vinson
Casey	Jacoway	Ogden	Walsh
Clark, Mo.	James	Oldfield	Walters
Collier	Johnson, Ky.	Oliver	Watkins
Connally	Johnson, Miss.	Overstreet	Webb
Cooper	Jones, Tex.	Park	Welling
Crago	Juul	Parrish	Welty
Crisp	Kearns	Quin	Wilson, La.
Currie, Mich.	Kelly, Pa.	Ragsdale	Wilson, Pa.
Davey	Kettner	Rainey, H. T.	Wingo
Davis, Tenn.	Kincheloe	Ramseyer	Woods, Va.
Dickinson, Mo.	Kitchin	Randall, Calif.	Young, N. Dak.
Dominick	Lampert	Rayburn	Young, Tex.
Doremus	Lanham	Ricketts	

#### NAYS—129.

Ackerman	Briggs	Burdick	Campbell, Kans.
Andrews, Nebr.	Brooks, Ill.	Burke	Chindblom
Benham	Browning	Butler	Christopherson

Classon	Greene, Mass.	Luce	Sanders, Ind.
Clergy, Vt.	Griest	Luhling	Siegel
Coady	Griffin	McArthur	Sinnott
Cole	Hadley	McFadden	Smith, Idaho
Cramton	Hawley	McKinley	Smith, Mich.
Crowther	Hayden	McLaughlin, Mich.	Snell
Curry, Calif.	Hayes	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Snyder
Dale	Hernandez	McPherson	Strong, Pa.
Darrow	Hickey	MacGregor	Temple
Davis, Minn.	Hicks	Magee	Thompson, Ohio
Dempsey	Hoch	Montague	Tilson
Denison	Holland	Moore, Pa.	Timberlake
Dickinson, Iowa	Houghton	Moore, Va.	Tincher
Dyer	Humphreys	Moores, Ind.	Valle
Elliott	Husted	Mott	Vestal
Ellsworth	Ireland	Newton, Mo.	Voigt
Elston	Jefferis	Olney	Volstead
Esch	Johnson, S. Dak.	Osborne	Wason
Evans, Nebr.	Johnson, Wash.	Parker	Watson, Pa.
Fess	Jones, Pa.	Peters	Watson, Va.
Fitzgerald	Kendall	Platt	Weaver
Flood	Kennedy, Iowa	Radcliffe	Webster
Focht	Kennedy, R. I.	Rainey, J. W.	Wheeler
Foster	Kinkaid	Raker	Williams
French	Klecza	Reed, N. Y.	Winslow
Fuller, Ill.	Kraus	Reed, W. Va.	Wood, Ind.
Gallagher	Kreider	Rhodes	Yates
Ganly	LaGuardia	Riddick	
Good	Leibach	Rogers	
Gould		Rowe	

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3.

Bell Cannon White, Me.

## NOT VOTING—139.

Andrews, Md.	Freeman	McClintic	Sabath
Anthony	Fuller, Mass.	McCulloch	Sanders, N. Y.
Aswell	Gallivan	McDuffie	Sanford
Bacharach	Garland	McGlennon	Scott
Baer	Glynn	McKenzie	Scully
Benson	Godwin, N. C.	McKinley	Sherwood
Blackmon	Goldfogle	MacCrate	Shreve
Bland, Ind.	Goodall	Madden	Sims
Bland, Va.	Goodykoontz	Maher	Sinclair
Bocher	Graham, Pa.	Major	Slemp
Bowers	Hamill	Mann	Smith, Ill.
Britten	Hamilton	Mansfield	Smith, N. Y.
Brooks, Pa.	Hardy, Tex.	Martin	Steagall
Brown	Harrison	Mason	Steele
Burrroughs	Haskell	Mead	Steenerson
Campbell, Pa.	Heflin	Merritt	Stephens, Miss.
Cantrill	Hersey	Monahan, Wis.	Stephens, Ohio
Carss	Hill	Morin	Stiness
Clark, Fla.	Hulings	Mudd	Strong, Kans.
Copley	Hull, Iowa	Murphy	Sullivan
Costello	Hutchinson	Neely	Sweet
Cullen	Johnston, N. Y.	Padgett	Taylor, Tenn.
Dallinger	Kahn	Paige	Tinkham
Dent	Kelley, Mich.	Pell	Towner
Dewalt	Kiess	Phelan	Treadway
Donovan	King	Porter	Vare
Dooling	Knutson	Pou	Ward
Dunn	Langley	Parnell	Whaley
Dupré	Larsen	Ramsey	White, Kans.
Eagan	Lee, Ga.	Randall, Wis.	Wilson, Ill.
Eagle	Lever	Reavis	Wise
Emerson	Linthicum	Reber	Woodyard
Evans, Mont.	Little	Rodenberg	Wright
Fairfield	Longworth	Rowan	Zihlman
Fordney	Lufkin	Rucker	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:  
Until further notice:

Mr. WOODYARD with Mr. AYRES.  
Mr. BACHARACH with Mr. WHALEY.  
Mr. BLAND of Indiana with Mr. WRIGHT.  
Mr. BOWERS with Mr. SULLIVAN.  
Mr. BRITTEN with Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi.  
Mr. BURBROUGHS with Mr. STEELE.  
Mr. SMITH of Illinois with Mr. RUCKER.  
Mr. DUNN with Mr. SMITH of New York.  
Mr. EMERSON with Mr. SHERWOOD.  
Mr. FORDNEY with Mr. SIMS.  
Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts with Mr. SCULLY.  
Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania with Mr. POU.  
Mr. HAMILTON with Mr. ROWAN.  
Mr. HUTCHINSON with Mr. PHELAN.  
Mr. KELLEY of Michigan with Mr. PADGETT.  
Mr. KIESS with Mr. MEAD.  
Mr. LANGLEY with Mr. MARTIN.  
Mr. LUFKIN with Mr. MANSFIELD.  
Mr. LONGWORTH with Mr. MAHER.  
Mr. MCCULLOCH with Mr. MAJOR.  
Mr. MCKENZIE with Mr. LINTHICUM.  
Mr. MCKINLEY with Mr. LEVER.  
Mr. MADDEN with Mr. LEE of Georgia.  
Mr. MASON with Mr. HEFLIN.  
Mr. MUDD with Mr. JOHNSON of New York.  
Mr. PORTER with Mr. HARDY of Texas.  
Mr. MURPHY with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.

Mr. PAIGE with Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina.  
Mr. RAMSEY with Mr. EAGLE.  
Mr. REBER with Mr. DUPRE.  
Mr. RODENBERG with Mr. DOOLING.  
Mr. SINCLAIR with Mr. DONOVAN.  
Mr. STEENERSON with Mr. DEWALT.  
Mr. STINESS with Mr. CLARK of Florida.  
Mr. TINKHAM with Mr. CULLEN.  
Mr. TOWNER with Mr. CANTRILL.  
Mr. WARD with Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania.  
Mr. WHITE of Kansas with Mr. BLAND of Virginia.  
Mr. VARE with Mr. BENSON.  
Mr. MORIN with Mr. EAGAN.  
Mr. KNUTSON with Mr. BELL (from Tuesday, June 24, to July 6).  
Mr. KING with Mr. NEELY.  
Mr. MANN with Mr. BLACKMON.  
Mr. DALLINGER with Mr. GALLIVAN.  
Mr. ANTHONY with Mr. PELL.  
Mr. KAHN with Mr. DENT.  
Mr. MACCRATE with Mr. LARSEN.  
Mr. GRIEST with Mr. WISE.  
Mr. SANFORD with Mr. HARRISON.  
Mr. TREADWAY with Mr. BOOHER.  
Mr. PURNELL with Mr. MCCLINTIC (about July 16).  
Mr. WHITE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire if the gentleman from Texas, Mr. HARDY, voted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. He did not.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from Texas for the day. I withdraw my vote of "no" and desire to be recorded as "present."

The name of Mr. WHITE of Maine was called, and he answered "Present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to was laid on the table.

The Chair announced the following conferees: Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota, Mr. CRAMTON, Mr. BUCHANAN.

## OBJECTIONABLE WORDS IN DEBATE.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate resolution No. 94, on the Speaker's desk, referring to the remarks of the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. JOHNSON, in respect to the Senator from Ohio, Mr. POMERENE, be referred to the Committee on Rules of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state to the gentleman that the resolution has already been referred to the Committee on Rules.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HULINGS] to-morrow I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, for the present I shall have to object.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. McDUFFIE, for the balance of the day on account of official business.

## ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, June 27, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting notice of an error in the figures for Terre Haute, Ind., item No. 20, Exhibit B (H. Doc. No. 136) was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.



### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. ROGERS, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 139) amending public resolution No. 33, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 73), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, from the Committee on Labor, to which was referred the resolution (H. Res. 128) requesting the Secretary of Labor to furnish the House of Representatives certain information, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 75), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee on the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. EDMONDS, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2452) for the relief of Charles A. Carey, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 72), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HERNANDEZ, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 683) for the relief of William E. Johnson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 74), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 628) granting an increase of pension to Joseph McClure; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 779) granting a pension to Otto M. Payton; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2009) granting a pension to Mary J. Doyle; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2010) granting a pension to Angeline E. Holt; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 3504) granting an increase of pension to George W. Hyland; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 3554) granting an increase of pension to Rudolph Hiller; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 3803) granting a pension to Eliza J. St. Clair; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4961) granting an increase of pension to Simon P. Kieffer; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: A bill (H. R. 6737) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Morris, county of Stevens, Minn., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MASON: A bill (H. R. 6738) to enable the Government to carry out the recommendations of the committees in Congress and to establish a home or homes for the aged and infirm colored people and working girls, and to establish an industrial farm and to aid the people who must move from the alleys in the District of Columbia, and to provide work for the colored youth during the summer vacation, and to provide work for the returning colored soldiers; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STEVENSON: A bill (H. R. 6739) to amend section 5200 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6740) to amend subdivision 4, section 13, of the Federal reserve act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RADCLIFFE: A bill (H. R. 6741) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Pompton Lakes Borough, county of Passaic, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6742) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the township of Little Falls, county of Passaic, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6743) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Hawthorne, county of Passaic, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6744) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to North Haledon Borough, county of Passaic, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6745) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Wayne township, county of Passaic, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 6746) pertaining to citizenship and the dissemination of knowledge to stimulate loyalty; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 6747) to repeal the sections of the war-revenue act, approved October 3, 1917, relating to and providing for a zone system for second-class mail matter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAGUARDIA: A bill (H. R. 6748) to amend the revenue act of 1918, in relation to the estates of soldiers and sailors dying in service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 6749) to abolish the Subtreasuries and to transfer their duties to the Federal reserve banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 6750) to deport certain undesirable aliens and to deny readmission to those deported; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 6751) to aid in the construction of the Roosevelt Highway along the Pacific coast of Oregon; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: A bill (H. R. 6752) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the town of West Orange, N. J., for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLACK: A bill (H. R. 6753) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to John C. Burks Camp, United Confederate Veterans, Clarksville, Tex., and to Camp County, Tex., and to Cass County, Tex., and to Titus County, Tex., and to Morris County, Tex., and to Marion County, Tex., and to Bowie County, Tex., and to Lamar County, Tex., and to Delta County, Tex., and to Hopkins County, Tex., and to Franklin County, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece or other trophy of similar character; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 6754) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Mankato, county of Blue Earth, Minn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6755) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of New Uln, county of Brown, Minn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6756) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Blue Earth, county of Faribault, Minn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6757) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of St. James, county of Watonwan, Minn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6758) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Fairmont, county of Martin, Minn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6759) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Windom, Minn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6760) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Jackson, Minn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6761) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Worthington, Minn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6762) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Slayton, Minn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6763) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Pipestone, Minn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6764) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Luverne, Minn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6765) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Redwood Falls, Minn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6766) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Ivanhoe, Minn., one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: A bill (H. R. 6767) to provide for the enforcement of war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDALL of California: Resolution (H. Res. 139) to protect the Nation's birthday against desecration by a prize fight; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 140) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent to Alice Q. Lovell and W. S. Lovell; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 141) favoring the choice of Boston as one of the free ports of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 6768) granting an increase of pension to William T. O'Bannon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 6769) granting a pension to Alice Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 6770) granting an increase of pension to John H. Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ECHOLS: A bill (H. R. 6771) to reimburse Tennie A. Anderson, postmaster at Maplewood, Fayette County, W. Va., for money, money orders, and postage stamps stolen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 6772) authorizing and directing the transfer of 10 acres of land to rural high-school district No. 1, Lapwai, Idaho; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6773) for the relief of Albert C. Burgess; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KINCHELOE: A bill (H. R. 6774) granting an increase of pension to Edward S. Clark; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: A bill (H. R. 6775) granting a pension to Eliza Gnatz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 6776) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay war-risk insurance to the foster parents of Edward Short; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McARTHUR: A bill (H. R. 6777) granting a pension to Anna Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6778) granting a pension to Mary R. Adair; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6779) granting a pension to Mary R. Melinger; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SIEGEL: A bill (H. R. 6780) for the relief of Barney M. Hornblas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STINESS: A bill (H. R. 6781) granting a pension to Cora W. Anderson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6782) granting a pension to Georgie O. Austin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: A bill (H. R. 6783) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Gibbins; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 6784) granting a pension to George W. Bales; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WALSH: A bill (H. R. 6785) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Beard; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WELTY: A bill (H. R. 6786) granting a pension to Presley F. Black; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6787) granting a pension to Marion Carnahan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of sundry citizens of Springfield, Mass., asking for repeal of tax on candy, ice cream, and soda-fountain foods and drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), petition of sundry employees of the New York & New England Co., against the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also (by request), petition of Stephen L. Le Compte, of Baltimore, Md., protesting against any modification of the war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), petition of sundry citizens of Baltimore, Md., for the repeal of tax on candy, ice cream, and soda-fountain foods and drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), petition of H. E. Early and others, protesting against any laws to enforce military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROWNING: Petition of District Association No. 5, New Jersey State Nurses' Association, Camden; also of citizens of Camden, N. J., urging legislation to confer military rank upon Army nurses; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BOIES: Petition of National Confectioners' Association of United States, for repeal of excise tax on candy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Rock Valley, Alvord, Rock Rapids, Inwood, Archer, Sheldon, Hospers, and Soubay, all in the State of Iowa, representing 134 men from Sioux, Lyon, and O'Brien Counties, protesting against the tax on candy, ice cream, and soda-fountain foods and drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAREW: Petition of National Confectioners' Association of the United States, for the repeal of excise tax on candy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLE: Petitions of Riley Creek Baptist Church, of Hanover County, and Presbyterian Church and Christian Endeavor Society of Marseilles, both in the State of Ohio, protesting against repeal of the war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Schofield and Wausau, Wis., protesting against the exclusion from the House of Representatives of Victor Berger; to the Committee on Elections No. 1.

By Mr. CURRIE of Michigan: Petition of Mr. E. G. Hopkins and various other persons in Mecosta County, Mich., requesting the repeal of the provisions in the revenue act taxing sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of citizens of La Crosse, Wis., asking for repeal of tax on candy, ice cream, and soda-fountain foods and drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRENCH: Petition for repeal of tax on candy, ice cream, and soda-fountain foods and drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of Rev. H. F. Lawler and 300 other citizens of Belvidere, Ill., opposing repeal of the war-time prohibition measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HASTINGS: Petition of the residents of Cherokee County, Okla., for repeal of stamp taxes on family medicines, toilet preparations, clothing, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the citizens of Wagoner County, Okla., for repeal of stamp tax on family medicines, stock medicines, toilet preparations, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of Cooks' Union, Local No. 44, of San Francisco, Calif., indorsing farm homes for returned soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, urging Congress to adopt a national budget system; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of City Federation of Women's Clubs, of San Francisco, indorsing work of Naturalization Bureau; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of City Federation of Women's Clubs, of San Francisco, urging passage of amendment to naturalization laws so as to permit distribution of textbooks on duties of American citizenship to all foreigners attending school, whether applicants for citizenship or not; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of City Federation of Women's Clubs, of San Francisco, urging passage of legislation to grant certificates of citizenship to wives and children of naturalized citizens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: Resolution of the Board of Commerce, Pontiac, Mich., urging the deepening of the St. Lawrence River and Welland Canal and the construction of larger and better locks, so that transportation of ocean boats may be had to and from the Great Lakes; also that the State of Michigan create a commission and appropriate sufficient money to cooperate with the United States Congress making the matter a part of our national program; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Petition of members of Grace United Evangelical Church, of Wilkinsburg, Pa., pro-



testing against repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring repeal of taxes on candy, ice cream, and soda-fountain drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: Petition of First Methodist Church, Paterson, N. J., asking enforcement of prohibition act and extending prohibition to Americans in China and wherever else treaties permit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of Federated Clubs of New Haven, Conn., protesting against enforcement of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGEE: Petition of William F. Beesley and other residents of Syracuse, N. Y., favoring strong prohibition enforcement legislation, definition of intoxicating liquors as including all alcoholic liquors, and extending prohibition to American citizens in China and wherever else treaties permit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petition of the American Manufacturers' Export Association, urging an increase of salaries in the Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of sundry citizens of Fulton, N. Y., protesting against the repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of New York, protesting against the repeal of the war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of New York, protesting against the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of residents of Fulton, N. Y., protesting against repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota: Petition of Gust A. Heinman and 35 other citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., that this session of Congress enact laws providing for full enforcement of the eighteenth amendment, and also definitely define intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NOLAN: Petition from Local No. 854, Brotherhood of Railway Clerks of San Francisco, Calif., protesting against the immediate return of the railroads to private ownership; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions adopted by the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce favoring a national budget system; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition from Vickery, Atkins & Torrey of San Francisco, Calif., for the repeal of section 902 of the revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of American Manufacturers' Export Association for additional salaries and appropriations for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Land Bank of the State of New York, asking for a law exempting land-bank bonds from Federal taxes except inheritance taxes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PAIGE: Protest of the First Congregational Church of Royalston, Mass., against modification of the war prohibition measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RADCLIFFE: Petition of Baptist Home Missionary Secretary for New York and New Jersey, for House resolutions asking Gov. Cox, of Ohio, to protect Nation's birthday against desecration by a fight for title of world's champion prize fighter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Rev. Simon Blacker and many members of Broadway Reformed Church, Paterson, for a resolution in Congress asking Ohio governor to prevent desecration of Nation's birthday by Willard-Dempsey contest for title of champion prize fighter of the world; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of New Jersey, for prohibition enforcement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of National Cloak, Suit, and Skirt Manufacturers' Association, Cleveland, Ohio, protesting against tax on fur trimmings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of West Virginia Pulp & Paper Co., New York City, N. Y., referring to the proposed long and short haul amendment to section 4 of interstate-commerce act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Land Bank of State of New York, asking that the bonds issued by land bank be exempt from Federal taxes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of American Manufacturers' Export Association, indorsing the request of Secretary of Commerce for addi-

tional salaries and appropriations for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Ohio: Resolution of the division of manufacturers, Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, protesting against the continuance of Federal Employment Service and the subject of providing a national clearing house for employment; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, telegram from Cincinnati Manufacturing Confectioners' Association, protesting against the luxury tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SINCLAIR: Petition of residents of Minot, Douglas, Surrey, Norwich, and Max, N. Dak., for the repeal of the so-called stamp tax on medicines, toilet preparations, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Town Criers' Club of the city of Minot, N. Dak., indorsing the Smith-Townner educational bill (revised); to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of citizens of Plaza, N. Dak., urging repeal of tax on candy, ice cream, and soda-fountain drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: Petition of members of the First Methodist Church, of De Soto, Mo., including Sabbath school, Epworth League, and Young Men's Club, against any repeal of war-time prohibition measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WASON: Memorial of Colebrook Women's Christian Temperance Union, Colebrook, N. H., Mrs. Mariette Cummings, president, urging the enforcement of both war-time and constitutional prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of West Unity Women's Christian Temperance Union, West Unity, N. H., urging the enforcement of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania: Petition of 700 citizens of Pennsylvania, for repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WINSLOW: Petition filed by members of Independence Lodge, No. 300, International Order of Good Templars, of Worcester, Mass., urging enactment of legislation providing for enforcement of eighteenth amendment, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES: Petition of Rev. John H. Hopkins, rector of Church of the Redeemer of Chicago; Methodist Episcopal Church of Chestnut; First Methodist Episcopal Church of Galva; bishop of Evangelical Church of Evangelical Association of Forreston; First Methodist Episcopal Sunday School of Atlanta; the Disciples of Christ, in session at Murphysboro; Presbyterian Church of Elmira; St. Stephens Methodist Episcopal Church of Chicago; First Methodist Episcopal Church of Atlanta; Reitzel Bros., of Sterling; and International Order of Good Templars, of Chicago, all in the State of Illinois, urging prompt prohibition enactment of laws providing for full enforcement of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE.

FRIDAY, June 27, 1919.

(Legislative day of Monday, June 23, 1919.)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

### SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. WARREN. I ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6176, the sundry civil appropriation bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6176) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. WARREN. I ask that in the consideration of the bill the formal reading may be omitted, and that the bill may be read for amendment, the Senate committee amendments to be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask the Senator to yield to me for a moment, that I may present the conference report on the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

Mr. KING. The Senator from Kansas does not ask for its immediate consideration?